DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 079 888 EC 052 242

AUTHOR	Freedman, Ruth; And Others
TITLE	Exemplary Programs for the Handicapped. Volume I. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Abt Associates, Inc. Cambridge, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.; National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Task Force on Dissemination.
REPORT NO	AAI-73-82
PUB DATE	Jun 73
CONTRACT	OEC-0-72-5182
NOTE	125p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Case Studies; Early Childhood Education; Evaluation Criteria; *Exceptional Child Education; *Handicapped Children; Manpower Needs; *National Surveys; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

Presented is the final report of a study which assessed the effectiveness of 50 Bureau of Education for the Handicapped programs and selected 17 of the programs as providing exemplary services for handicapped people in the areas of career education, early childhood education, and manpower development. Considered separately are the three phases of the study: program selection, on-site data collection, and case study preparation. The program selection phase is reported to have involved the development and revision of selection criteria, a telephone survey, staff training, and program rating and scoring procedures. Explained to be part of the on-site data collection phase are development of the case study outline and guide, the on-site pretest, and field training of staff. Actual preparation of the case studies is said to have included development and revision of the case study outline, review of pretest case studies, and case study preparation and review. Noted are problems encountered at each phase of the study. Abstracts of the case studies are presented as well as a program comparison chart. Among recommendations for further study is an assessment of the information requirements of potential program replicators. Appended are the initial and revised criteria list and weightings, forms and questions used for the telephone survey, programs' percentage scores according to program category, and the case study field guide. (See EC 052 243, EC 052 244, and EC 052 245 for complete case studies). (DB)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 079889

EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS FOR THE HANDICAPPED

A PROJECT TO ASSESS AND DOCUMENT
EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS FOR THE EDUCATION
OF THE HANDICAPPED

BY ABT ASSOCIATES INC.
FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
AND THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION, BUREAU
OF EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

EC052242

ED 079888

This report was prepared for:

The U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Institute of Education, Task Force on Dissemination and the U.S. Office of Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

by:

Abt Associates Inc.
Human Development Division
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

under

Contract No. OEC-0-72-5182

June 1973

Volume I

FINAL REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AA1 Report No. 73-82

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Project Director and Deputy Director of this study are deeply grateful to the many individuals who contributed their expertise and time to this project. Above all, we would like to acknowledge our debt to the directors and staff of the projects contacted during the telephone survey and those which we subsequently visited. We especially thank the staff and students of projects visited for their willingness to endure the intrusion of demanding field teams and for openly offering their time and full cooperation.

Our deepest debt is to Linda Levy of the NIE Task Force on Dissemination, who served as Project Officer for this study, and Dr. Max Mueller, Director of the BEH Research Division, for their overall guidance and assistance in the conduct of this study. Abt Associates is extremely grateful for their continued support and attention to all requests for assistance.

Our sincere appreciation is extended to the following members of the Audience Panel who participated in the formulation of the slection criteria and who addressed a number of important research issues and substantive questions: Margaret Brewster, Lars Guldager, Burton Blatt, Howard Spicker, Cynthia Gilles, Michael Galazan and John Kidd.

The conscientious efforts of Patricia Bergstein, Laura Studen, Judith Platt, Lorrie Stuart and Linda Hailey, who served as field staff and case study authors, deserve our special thanks. Without their cooperation and sincere interest, final preparation of the case studies would not have been possible. Christine Jerome deserves special recognition for her patient efforts in revising and editing each case study. We are also grateful to Sherry Halpern who provided competent assistance in the production of the reports.

Finally, we wish to thank Sydelle Shapiro, Research and Design Group Monitor, and Richard Ruopp, Vice President and Area Manager of the Human Development Group, who carefully reviewed all contract activities and products and provided on-going support and guidance in the management and administration of this project.

Ruth Freedman
Donna Warner
Pat Cook

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 Introduction 1

2.0 Program Selection 4

2.1.1 Selection Criteria 4

2.1.2 Revision and Weighting of Selection Criteria 5

2.1.3 Development of Overall Selection Criteria 7

2.2 Telephone Survey 8

2.2.1 Survey Design 8

2.2.2 Staff Training 9

2.2.3 Conduct of the Survey 10

2.2.4 Program Rating Procedures 10

2.3 Program Scoring Procedures 10

2.4 Problems Encountered in Program Selection 13

3.0 On-Site Data Collection 16

3.1 Development of the Case Study Outline and Guide ... 18

3.2 On-Site Pre-Test 19

3.3 Field Training 19

3.4 Problems Encountered During the Field Effort 21

4.0 Preparation of Case Studies 23

4.1 Development and Revision of Case Study Outline 23

4.1.1 Review of Pre-Test Case Studies 23

4.1.2 Case Study Outline Revisions 24

4.2 Case Study Preparation and Review Process 26

4.3 Problems Encountered During Case Study Preparation 28

5.0 Case Study Abstracts and Program Comparison Chart 30

5.1 Program Comparison Chart 32

5.2 Abstracts of Manpower Development Programs 36

5.2.1 Clinical Teacher Model Project, Tallahassee, Florida 36

5.2.2 Diversified Occupations Professionals Development Program, Burlington, Vermont 38

Page

5.2.3 Mark Twain Teacher Internship Program, Rockville Maryland 40
5.3 Abstracts of Career Education Programs 42
5.3.1 Career Development Center, Syosset, New York 42
5.3.2 Mobile Unit for Vocational Evaluation, Towson Maryland 44
5.3.3 Project SERVE, St. Paul, Minnesota 46
5.3.4 Project Worker, Fullerton, California 48
5.3.5 Technical Vocational Program for Deaf Students, St. Paul, Minnesota 49
5.3.6 Vocational Village, Portland, Oregon 50
5.4 Abstracts of Early Childhood Education Programs .. 51
5.4.1 Chapel Hill Training/Outreach Project, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 51
5.4.2 Magnolia Model Preschool Program, Magnolia, Arkansas 53
5.4.3 Model Preschool Program, Seattle, Washington 55
5.4.4 P.E.E.C.H. Project, Champaign-Urbana, Illinois ... 57
5.4.5 Portage Project, Portage, Wisconsin 58
5.4.6 Preschool and Early Education Project, Starkville, Mississippi 60
5.4.7 Rutland Center, Athens, Georgia 61
5.4.8 UNISTAPS Project, Minneapolis, Minnesota 63

6.0 Recommendations for Further Study..... 65

7.0 Appendices 68

7.1 Appendix A: Original NIE/BEH Selection Criteria With Initial Revisions by Abt Associates 69
7.2 Appendix B: Final Revised Criteria List and Weightings 76
7.3 Appendix C: Telephone Survey 83
7.4 Appendix D: Programs' Percentage Score According to Program Category 104
7.5 Appendix E: Case Study Field Guide 107

1.0 Introduction

On June 27, 1972 Abt Associates Inc. was awarded a 12 month contract by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (BEH) and the National Institute of Education (NIE) Task Force on Dissemination to, "Assess, Document and Spread Exemplary Programs for the Handicapped". The purpose of the study was to gather the information and extant data needed to assess the effectiveness of 50 individual BEH programs, conduct the assessments, select approximately 20 of the best programs among these, and prepare written descriptions of the 20 suitable for publication and national dissemination. Four categories of educational programs for handicapped people were to be represented in the case descriptions -- full services, career education, manpower, and early childhood education. The final program descriptions, or case studies as Abt Associates envisioned them, were to reach the following recipient audiences:

- Agencies interested in developing projects and applying for grants;
- Personnel currently operating projects who are interested in improving practices; and
- School personnel including administrators, counselors, teachers and boards of education who require information concerning decisions to improve and expand services to handicapped children.

The case studies ultimately were to provide educational decisionmakers with information on successful or notable features of the selected programs for potential replication and/or adaption.

The study was conducted in three phases: program selection, on-site data collection, and case study preparation. The tasks of the program selection phase included:

- assembling a panel of experts in the field of special education to represent the various "audiences" of the case studies;
- gathering BEH file data on each of the fifty (50) programs to aid in selection decisions;
- refining the NIE/BEH criteria for selection of "exemplary" programs;
- developing and implementing a telephone survey to assess the fifty programs and make final selection decisions, and

- developing the format and scope of the final case studies.

During the on-site collection phase of the study,

- the Case Study Outline was completed;
- the data needed from each site was compiled into a Case Study Guide which provided field staff with cross-site question areas;
- site contact and scheduling for the field visits was completed;
- a pre-test of the Case Study Guide and the overall field plan was effected at two sites, resulting in the preparation of two prototype case studies; and
- an experienced field staff of six Abt Associates analysts proceeded to conduct the field effort and to write 20-30 page case studies on each of the seventeen sites they visited.

The tasks of the case study preparation phase included:

- review of pre-test case studies by BEH/NIE Project Monitors and members of the Audience Panel
- revisions of the Case Study Outline to yield less lengthy and substantive reports
- writing of seventeen case studies;
- circulation of each study through a three-stage editing and review process within Abt Associates;
- review of each case study by the respective program;
- final editing of each case study by an outside consultant to the project.

This report (Volume I) documents the activities involved in the conduct of the study. Sections 2.0, 3.0, and 4.0 of the report detail the specific procedures and products of the major phases as outlined above, including the problems encountered over the course of each phase. Section 5.0 offers an overview of the seventeen case studies including an abstract of each exemplary program and a comparison chart delineating major program characteristics. Section 6.0 includes Abt Associates recommendations for further study in areas related to education of the handicapped.

The seventeen program descriptions, which constitute the major product of

this study, are presented in three separate volumes for easy reference: Volume II. Career Education, Volume III. Early Childhood Education, and Volume IV. Manpower Development.

2.0 Program Selection

Abt Associates agreed to select approximately 20 exemplary programs for case study from an initial sample of 50 programs provided by BEH. This initial list was drawn from the various program offices represented in the four categories of services -- manpower, early childhood, full services and career education. From this list, Abt Associates, in conjunction with NIE and BEH, was to select projects which appeared to have interesting and promising features worthy of further study and description.

2.1.1 Selection Criteria

In order to carry out the selection process, BEH and NIE supplied the Abt staff with a list of general criteria and specific criteria (related to each of the four categories of programs) upon which to assess programs' notable features. The original list of criteria (Appendix A) was revised by Abt staff (see underlined sections of Appendix A) in an effort to clarify and operationalize the concepts underlying these criteria. This revised list was then submitted for review to a consultant audience panel assembled for a workshop at Abt Associates.

Composed of seven experts in the field of special education, the Panel aided the project staff in the development and refinement of the selection criteria and the review of the case studies in terms of their usefulness to the three types of potential "audiences" which the panel represented. Members of the audience panel were:

- Ms. Margaret Brewster, Director of the Dimock Street Preschool for Handicapped Children, Roxbury, Massachusetts;
- Dr. Burton Blatt, Chairman of the Department of Special Education, Syracuse University;
- Mr. Michael Galazan, Director of Jewish Vocational Services of Milwaukee, Wisconsin;
- Ms. Cynthia Gilles, Coordinator of the New England Instructional Materials Center;
- Mr. Lars Guldager, Director of the Community at Marlboro (Community Residence for the Mentally Retarded);

- Dr. John Kidd, Director of the St. Louis Special School District; and
- Dr. Howard Spicker, Chairman of the Department of Special Education, Indiana University.

2.1.2 Revision and Weighting of Selecting Criteria

The Audience Panel members raised a number of important points regarding the whole issue of "exemplariness" in relation to this study. Concerned that neither Abt Associates nor the Panel had been involved in the selection of the initial fifty programs or the development of the initial selection criteria, they expressed reservation as to whether the fifty programs in fact represented the "best" or most "exemplary" programs funded by the Bureau. The Panel therefore offered the following definition of exemplariness as a useful framework for selecting the final programs:

> "In using the word exemplary with regard to the final sample of twenty programs, Abt Associates is referring to the interesting and promising features of programs which appear to be worthy of further study. We wish to make clear at the outset that we are not selecting programs on the basis of their total exemplariness but rather on the basis of particular elements of the program which appear to be notable. In short, the word exemplary will refer to elements in programs which serve as examples in the field.
>
> This distinction is made because we feel that it is next to impossible to locate programs which, across the board, are exemplary. It is possible, however, to select programs which have some elements which are noteworthy and others which may not be. Therefore, given the sample of fifty programs selected by BEH, Abt Associates has selected those twenty programs which appear to have elements within them which are most exemplary."

In reviewing the criteria list, the Panel felt it included a number of "subsistence" criteria or standards which all BEH programs had to meet for continued funding. These criteria were not "exemplariness" criteria and to that extent had to be revised to be useful for program selection. For example, one of the criteria to be used for selecting early childhood programs stated that, "Each project must serve children from birth to eight years."

By definition, early childhood programs serve this age group; therefore, the criterion was not useful in selecting "exemplary" early childhood programs.

The major portion of the Audience Panel Workshop, then, was spent revising the selection criteria to make them more specific, to provide operational definitions where necessary, and to eliminate those criteria which would not assess "exemplariness."

The final revised list of criteria (Appendix B) contains eleven general criteria to be applied across the four program categories of early childhood education, manpower development, career education and full services. These general criteria assess the following program dimensions:

- program objectives, goals, and evaluation strategies
- replicability
- length of operation
- cost information
- comprehensiveness of the program
- relationships with outside agencies
- staff: student ratios

In addition to the general criteria, the list contains criteria specific to each of the program categories.

- Nine early childhood criteria assess:
  - replication activities
  - parent and family participation in the program
  - cooperation with local schools and other community agencies
  - evaluation activities
  - use of consultants
  - in-service training
  - financial contributions from local sources

- Four manpower development criteria assess:
  - innovativeness of the program
  - evaluation design
  - experimental nature of the project
  - level of training

- Six career education criteria assess:

  - skill level and employability of the program graduates
  - job placement services
  - follow-up and re-training services
  - vocational counseling and diagnosis

- Five full services criteria assess:

  - direct instructional services to children
  - scope of the program
  - coordination with other agencies
  - provision of services to children from non-public school

In addition to revising the criteria to make them more specific measures of exemplariness, each criterion was assigned a weighting score for its importance in the selection process. These weightings (see Appendix B), reviewed by the Audience Panel and NIE and BEH staff, were based on the following scale:

Weighting

3 Criterion is extremely important to consider in the selection process

2 Criterion is important to consider in the selection process

1 Criterion is not very important to consider in the selection process

0 Criterion is not relevant or useful and therefore should not be utilized in the selection process

A total of 19 three's, 11 two's, and 5 one's were assigned to the criteria. In the revision process all criteria assigned a "0" were eliminated from the final list.

2.1.3 Development of Overall Selection Criteria

The Audience Panel suggested that the revised criteria and their associated weightings should be used as minimal guidelines and that the final sample

of programs should be selected according to the extent to which they met the following overall selection criteria:

- Integration Opportunities: Extent to which the program provides opportunities for its students and prepares them according to their needs and maximum potential for integration into the mainstream of society (e.g., integration into public school activities and classes, into social, recreational, and vocational experiences in the community, etc.). In Manpower programs, this criterion would refer to the extent to which the training program prepares personnel to integrate students into the community.

- Extended Involvement: Extent to which the program involves staff, parents, consumers, community representatives, and specialists in the development of the program (e.g., in program planning, policy-making, evaluation, program modification, determination of users' needs, fund-raising,etc.).

- Program Accountability: Extent to which the program is accountable to the users of its services. This would be indicated by an on-going evaluation process which assesses the effectiveness of the program in meeting the needs of the population served and modifies the program on the basis of this process.

Panel members felt that each of the revised criteria should be related to one of the overall selection criteria which represented the most important bases upon which to select exemplary programs with interesting and promising features worthy of further study.

2.2 The Telephone Survey

2.2.1 Survey Design

The purpose of the telephone survey was to collect sufficient information about each of the fifty (50) programs in the initial sample so that, in conjunction with program materials supplied through BEH, a decision could be made on the twenty (20) programs to be selected for final study. The survey, (see Appendix C), was designed by Abt staff to elicit as much information about a program as possible within a reasonable block of telephone time (approximately 45 minutes). Questions were included which directly assessed the extent to which the programs met the various selection criteria described

above. In addition, questions were asked about the demographic features of the program including number of students, range of handicaps served, number and positions of staff, sex and racial distributions of students and staff. The director of each program was also asked to comment on the aspects of the program which he/she felt were notable and worthy of further study and description. In addition, the program's willingness and availability for participation in the study was assessed and tentative dates for site visits were established. Finally, programs were requested to send us other materials which explained their program to further aid us in final decision-making. Over 75% of 50 programs in the initial sample responded to this request.

2.2.2 Staff Training

The Abt staff members chosen to conduct the telephone survey were selected for long term participation in the study, so as to maximize their familiarity with and knowledge across the various programs eventually chosen for final study. Four staff members (including the Project Directors) conducted the survey, with one person responsible for the surveys in each of the program categories -- Manpower, Full Services, Early Childhood and Career Education. The two staff who assisted the Directors of the project subsequently served as field staff at sites which they had telephoned during the survey.

All of the staff had previous experiences in conducting telephone surveys; however, the Project Directors discussed with the other two staff members the types of information to be elicited, question by question. Staff were given the available materials on each of the programs they were to call, and were instructed to read them prior to contacting the program.

2.2.3 Conduct of the Survey

The telephone survey was begun in mid-August, 1972, with the final calls being completed in mid-September. This was a much longer time period than was originally anticipated, since many of the programs were partially closed down for the summer months. In future studies of this type, we recommend that telephone surveys not be conducted during the summer.

The Abt callers received a very warm reception from many of the Program Directors. This was greatly facilitated by a letter sent by the Commissioner of BEH to inform them of our study and to elicit their cooperation. The survey proceeded very smoothly throughout, with a great deal of enthusiasm demonstrated by program personnel (except in a few isolated cases) about the possibility of their selection for further study. The only problems encountered were in contacting approximately six programs which had received their fourth and fifth year of funding in 1971-72 and were no longer in operation, or no longer visible as centrally located units appropriate for case study. In these cases, a decision was made to omit the program from consideration in the final sample.

2.2.4 Program Rating Procedures

After each telephone survey had been completed, the program was rated on the extent to which it met each of the Selection Criteria according to the following scale:

3 = program meets criterion with a high degree of quality

2 = program meets criterion with a moderate degree of quality

1 = program meets criterion with a low degree of quality

0 = program does not meet criterion at all

In each case, two and often three of the telephone survey staff (the Project Directors and one of the interviewers) were involved in the rating process. Each program was discussed and evaluated in terms of its survey responses and any program materials made available to us. Staff then rated the extent to which the particular program met each of the selection criteria. Ratings on each program within a category were reviewed again upon completion of all ratings of programs in that category in order to ensure that programs were being judged relative to each other, and to adjust for programs which had been contacted very early in the survey.

2.3 Program Scoring Procedures

The final programs were selected for case study on the basis of ratings they received on the various selection criteria. A program's score on any

particular criterion was a product of that program's rating and the weighting assigned to that criterion. Each program's individual scores were aggregated into three Overall Criteria Scores, based on the criteria suggested by the Audience Panel: Integration, Extended Involvement and Program Accountability (see p. 8 for full definitions).

After each program was assigned a Sum Score (the sum of its three Overall Criteria Scores), this score was then compared with the total possible score the program could have achieved. This ratio of a program's sum score: program's total possible score, resulted in a final percentage score which could then be compared with other program's final percentage scores. Twenty-two programs out of the total fifty scored at or above the 75th percentage using this process. (See Appendix D for listings of percentage scores according to program category).

Of the twenty-two programs which scored at or above the 75th percentage, seven programs were eliminated for the following reasons:

- three programs overlapped in scope and services with many higher scoring projects due to be case studied; therefore, a decision was made to drop them from the sample. These included two full service programs and one early early childhood program.

- a manpower program served only 18 students and employed one staff member. Project staff felt that the program was too limited in size to write up as a case study.

- an early childhood program tentatively selected on the basis of a telephone survey conducted in August, subsequently altered its goals and service delivery pattern considerably and no longer qualified under the established criteria.

- a full services program which served handicapped children over a multi-district area was deemed too difuse to write up via the case study method.

- a full services program whose sole objective was to disseminate media for instruction to the handicapped was ruled out due to the specificity of the project.

Fifteen programs were therefore selected for inclusion in the final sample. Two additional programs were added which had not been in the initial sample

of fifty. These two programs were suggested by BEH after the final selection had taken place; therefore, the two programs were contacted and the telephone survey was administered. Both programs scored above the 75th percentage.

SAMPLE SELECTED FOR CASE STUDY

Type of Program	Program Name
M	Mark Twain Teacher Internship Program Rockville, Maryland
M	Clinical Teacher Model Project Tallahassee, Florida
EC	UNISTAPS Project, Minneapolis, Minnesota
EC	Rutland Center, Athens, Georgia
EC	Preschool and Early Education Project Starkville, Mississippi
EC	Portage Project, Portage, Wisconsin
EC	P.E.E.C.H. Preschool Project, Champaign-Urbana, Illinois
M	Diversified Occupations Professionals Development Program, Burlington, Vermont
CE	Career Development Center, Syosset, New York
EC	Magnolia Preschool Program, Magnolia, Arkansas
EC	Model Preschool Program, Seattle, Washington
EC	Chapel Hill Training/Outreach Program Chapel Hill, North Carolina
CE	Vocational Village, Portland, Oregon
CE	Technical Vocational Program for Deaf Students, St. Paul, Minnesota
CE	Project Worker, Fullerton, California
CE	Project SERVE, St. Paul, Minnesota
CE	Mobil Unit for Vocational Evaluation, Towson, Maryland

Summary: 8 Early Childhoon (EC)
6 Career Education (CE)
3 Manpower (M)

Total: 17

2.4 Problems Encountered in Program Selection

A number of methodological problems evidenced themselves during this phase of the work which might prove instructive to the conduct of future research in this field. The Abt staff wish to make clear that virtually none of the problems which arose over the course of this project were insoluable, nor were they ever the cause of extensive delays, poor relations with sites, loss of staff, etc.

The major methodological problems encountered during the selection process were:

- Neither Abt Associates nor the Audience Panel was involved in the selection of the initial fifty programs or the development of the original selection criteria.
- The initial sample of fifty programs was considered too small and therefore limiting in the selection of twenty exemplary programs.
- Abt staff experienced difficulty in selecting twenty exemplary programs with a broad distribution among the four program categories.
- Methodologically, the telephone survey may not have been the best mechanism for making program selections.

2.4.1 Neither Abt Associates nor the Audience Panel Was Involved in the Selection of the Initial Fifty Programs or the Development of the Original Selection Criteria.

As discussed above, this was felt to constrain the final selection process. In future studies of this type we strongly suggest that the contractor assume responsibility or at least be involved in the initial design and selection process.

2.4.2 The Initial Sample of Fifty Programs Was Considered Too Small and Therefore Limiting in the Selection of Twenty Exemplary Programs.

Abt staff felt that it was difficult to select twenty exemplary programs from a universe as small as fifty. In future studies it might be useful to begin with a larger sample -- perhaps 100 programs -- and not to require that the contractor select a fixed number of exemplary programs. Hypothetically, if only two programs from the sample of 100 appear to be exemplary, then those should be the only programs to be written up as exemplary.

2.4.3 Abt Staff Experienced Some Difficulty in Selecting Twenty Exemplary Programs With a Broad Distribution Among the Four Program Categories.

Requiring such a distribution was felt to add a constraint to the selection of exemplary programs. We were faced with the problem: what if the twenty exemplary programs are all manpower or all early childhood? Although we were informed that an equal distribution among the programs selected was not necessary, we did feel some obligation to select some programs from each category. This was problematic when no full services programs were included in the final sample. The Abt staff felt that possibly the criteria did not sensitively assess full services programs which were characteristically different (in terms of size, focus, and operations) from the other programs included in the initial sample or that the full service programs were simply not "exemplary" compared to other programs surveyed.

2.4.4 Methodologically, the Telephone Survey May Not Have Been the Best Mechanism for Making Program Selections

It is extremely difficult to obtain a true picture of a program from a 45 minute telephone conversation with a project director. At best, a summary of the program's operations was obtained. At worst, discrepancies evidenced themselves between the information obtained over the telephone and what was observed by the field teams during site visits. The most serious distortion in data collected over the telephone lies in the director's facility with language (or lack thereof) and his/her overall salesmanship, enthusiasm about the project, and ability to "gloss over" many of

the less complimentary aspects of the program. Regardless of how experienced, sophisticated or inherently cynical the interviewer was, there were undoubtedly personality variables between directors and interviewers which interacted either for or against the selection of the programs.

If the financial resources were available, the Abt staff would have felt more confident of the "exemplariness" of the programs in the final sample, had we been able to briefly visit the fifty programs to administer the instrument used in the telephone survey on site, as well as to make preliminary observations of the program.

3.0 On-Site Data Collection

Six field staff in addition to the Project Directors conducted visits to the seventeen programs selected for in-depth case study. Each staff member visited a minimum of three and a maximum of six sites. The number of staff engaged in the field effort was purposely limited to increase cross-site reliability and to ensure greater consistency in the data collected and in case study preparation. Experience and insight gained during early site visits could also be applied during the later field efforts. Where possible, staff were also assigned to visit similar kinds of programs--all career education or early childhood education programs, for example. However, due to cost considerations, first priority in assignment of field staff to sites was geographic location; if two programs were located within the same region, the site team was assigned to visit both regardless of their type. Each program was visited by a two-person field team for 2½ days, a total of 4-5 person days per site. The decision was made to send two staff members to each site in order to gather an extensive amount of information within a limited time period and also to ensure a degree of objectivity and reliability across programs.

During the field visits, interviews were held with the project director; other key administrative staff; key program staff (head teachers, counselors, psychologists, parent coordinators); consumers of the services (parents, and students when appropriate); as well as community agency personnel, and local and state agency personnel who were directly linked to the program's operations. Because the visits were of such short duration, field team members tried to concentrate their interviews on key program staff and to avoid, where possible, interviews with persons whose information did not coincide with the topics listed in the Case Study Guide (see Section 3.1).

Generally, the field teams felt that the interviews with the director and other key administrative staff were most valuable in gathering the kinds

of information necessary for the case study. Interviews with persons only peripherally involved with the day-to-day operations of the program (e.g., heads of funding agencies or community personnel only indirectly linked to the program's services) were considered least valuable. In addition to the interviews, field staff spent time in observing the actual operations of the programs including classroom activities, parent meetings, and counseling or training sessions. These observations proved to be extremely worthwhile in informally validating many of the data obtained from interviews. In general, a flexible field schedule was adopted including both pre-arranged key interviews and unbooked time for field staff to reschedule meetings, investigate additional data sources, and fill-in information gaps.

What follows is the schedule for the site visit conducted at the PEECH Project in Champaign-Urbana, Illinois, October 5-6, 1972. The schedule is included as a prototype of the length and scope of interviews typically conducted over a two day period in this study.

Thursday, October 5

8:30	Orientation to project with key project staff
9:15	Observation of a demonstration; project overview
9:54	Classroom observation
10:15	Director of Speech and Language
11:00	Director of Motor Development
11:30	Dissemination Coordinators
12:15	Classroom staffing and lunch
1:15	Observation of demonstration session on parent involvement
2:00	Observation of demonstration session on classroom procedures
3:00	Observation of demonstration session on evaluation procedures

Friday, October 6

8:30	Program Coordinator
9:30	Parents
10:00	Director of Evaluation and paraprofessional evaluators
11:00	Parent Coordinator
11:45	Lunch
1:00	Observation of meeting of parent coordinator and staff
3:00	Project Director

3.1 Development of the Case Study Outline and Guide

In order to ensure uniformity of data collection and the resulting content of the case studies, a Case Study Outline and Guide were developed by Abt Associates for use during the field visits. The Outline, which is discussed further in section 4.0, detailed the major topics which would be covered in the final case study descriptions including project goals; history; organization; student, staff, parent and community compositions; program operations and service components; evaluation strategies and findings; costs; notable features; and replication recommendations to other programs.

The Case Study Guide (See Appendix E) listed pertinent questions under each of these topics to be covered with the program staff during each field visit. For example, under the section on parents, questions were asked regarding demographic characteristics of parents, parent involvement in the project and services offered to parents. The Guide was not intended for use as a questionnaire but rather, as a list of question areas to be covered with each program where appropriate.

The Guide was mailed to each program prior to the field visit in order to prepare the program staff for the kinds of information the Abt field team would be interested in obtaining. This procedure proved to be extremely

useful to both the Abt staff and the programs. Through the Guide, the programs were informed of the purpose and scope of the field visit beforehand and were able to set up appointments for the field team in advance of their visit. The field teams were therefore able to devote their time on-site to intensive information gathering with the most knowledgeable staff in each content area covered in the Guide.

3.2 On-Site Pre-Test

In order to test the field procedures described above and to assess the usefulness of the case study guide as an in-field reference, two field tests were conducted in early October prior to the principal field effort. Two day on-site visits were conducted at the PEECH (Precise Early Education for Children with Handicaps) Project in Champaign-Urbana, Illinois and the Diversified Occupations Professionals Development Program in Burlington, Vermont to assess the procedures and schedule and to gather data for case study preparation as part of the total effort. The pre-tests were conducted by different two-person teams, headed by the Project Director and Deputy Director, to provide an opportunity for management and field staff alike to gain early experience in the use of the guide and to contribute their observations to its refinement.

Results from the field test indicated that the two-day time allowance was adequate to collect all required data and that the field guide proved useful both in structuring interviews and gathering appropriate information, and in providing a manageable framework for translating data gathered in the field into case studies addressing potential user needs.

3.3 Field Training

After the pre-test had taken place and shortly before the first wave of

field visits were to begin, individual and group training of the field teams was conducted by Abt Associates. The training devices developed and used by the Project Directors were:

- a full day staff training seminar
- a Field Manual
- materials on each of the sites to be visited
- field team meetings with the director and deputy director immediately before and after the field visits

The full day staff training seminar was held to orient all field staff to the purposes of the study and the uses of the Case Study Outline and Guide. During this meeting, staff reviewed the Field Manual which included extensive instructions for staff on all procedures to be followed before, during and after the field visits including communications with sites (by telephone and letter); site scheduling procedures; travel arrangements; uses of the Outline and Guide; format of the case study and scheduled meetings with the Director and Deputy Project Director. In addition, two films on behavior modification and therapeutic intervention strategies were shown during the seminar as "warm-ups" for generating discussion on programs for education of the handicapped.

Each field team was given all the available information on their programs which existed in-house including the telephone survey and all BEH file materials, as well as any materials which might have been sent by the sites. After reviewing these materials each field team met with the Director and Deputy Project Director to discuss their programs in detail and to develop site-specific field strategies including interview needs, potential problems, and identifiable notable features. After each field visit was completed, the field teams met with the Director and Deputy Director for a de-briefing session to discuss the conduct of the visit, problems encountered and write-up plans.

Many of the field staff chosen for this study were specialists in early childhood education or special education, and had conducted field work in a wide range of educational and human service programs. These qualifications obviously contributed to the staff's sensitivity toward the programs under study. However, it was observed over the course of the study that the most important staff characteristic was the ability to help project administrators conceptualize their program as a whole and secondly to identify and describe the major program features in a fashion meaningful to a variety of potential readers. In short, the field staff were successful because they were extremely analytic and brought to this project not only substantive skills in the areas under study, but also a journalistic sense which allowed them to single out and describe the most important aspects of each program's operations.

3.4 Problems Encountered During the Field Effort

Aside from minor scheduling changes necessitated by either the site or Abt staff, virtually no problems were encountered in dealing with sites before, during or after the field visits. The field teams were extremely well received at all of the sites which was facilitated through early scheduling of site visits; communication about the purpose of the study; types of information required from the staff; use of the case studies, etc.; as well as the assurance that once the program had been selected for case study that Abt's role was to describe, not evaluate the project. Therefore, projects welcomed the field teams without the threat of receiving an unfavorable report. The Abt staff made it clear to the programs that they were visiting for the purpose of describing the operations of an "exemplary" program without making any personal evaluative judgements about the project's worth, success or overall effectiveness. In sum, the field staff were to serve as collectors of information and describers of program operation, not as evaluators of program effectiveness.

Over the course of the project, some discrepancy became evident between NIE/BEH's and Abt Associates' views on the contractor's evaluative role. NIE/BEH felt that the field visits were yet another step in the selection of programs which might be written up and disseminated. Abt was under the impression that the telephone survey was the final selection mechanism, and that all seventeen programs case studied would be published. (A letter to this effect was mailed by BEH to the 50 programs at the outset of the study). In future studies of this type we recommend that agreement be reached on this issue early in the study so that both the field teams and local program staffs are cognizant of the possible outcomes of the study.

A second issue which surfaced early in the study was the extensive amount of time that would be required to validate all the information collected on site. Although it was possible within a two day period for the Abt field teams to gather all the information needed for the development of case studies, it would probably have taken weeks to validate all aspects of the programs as described to us by key administrative staff. We recommend that in future studies of this type the validation issue be addressed in initial meetings between NIE/BEH and the contractor and that cost-effective means of verifying information at each site be developed and used.

4.0 Preparation of Case Studies

4.1 Development and Revision of Case Study Outline

The case study outline presented below was developed not only to guide field staff in gathering complete and appropriate data, but also to serve as a framework in writing the program descriptions.

Part One:	Overview
Part Two:	Program Description
	A. Goals
	B. History
	C. Program Organization
Part Three:	People in the Program
	A. Students
	B. Staff
	C. Parents
	D. Community
Part Four:	Program Operations
Part Five:	Program Evaluation
Part Six:	Program Costs
Part Seven:	Plans for the Future
Part Eight:	Notable Features

While the case studies were not intended as detailed "how to" guides, Abt Associates envisioned them as decision-oriented materials highlighting not only interesting and relevant program aspects, but also the inputs and processes involved in planning, implementing, and operating those components. The original case study outline, therefore, called for documentation of both major program components and the historical and administrative context within which the program functioned including: start-up procedures, problems encountered, changes over time in the program and its objectives, and an account of the administrative, community, and fiscal resources required to support continuation of the program. Budgets, staff and administrative organization charts, appendices of illustrative program materials and other support documents were considered appropriate for inclusion in the case studies to provide the user with sufficiently detailed information to decide wether or not to adapt or adopt the models described.

4.1.1 Review of Pre-Test Case Studies

In order to ensure the development of case studies consistent with user needs and overall study objectives two pre-test case studies were submitted to five

Audience Panel members, the NIE Project Officer and BEH staff for their review and approval. The Audience Panel was specifically requested to assess the merits of the sample descriptions with respect to the information needs of the audiences to be addressed. The following comments or opinions were shared by all of the consultants and resulted, where appropriate, in case study revisions.

- A standard Foreword should be included in each of the case studies describing the objectives of the dissemination; the criteria used in selecting programs for case study; the field process involved in collecting case study data.
- Detailed program budgets are not necessary nor should individual staff salaries be included. Generally, the budget section should be condensed.
- On the whole, the information contained in the appendices was considered very worthwhile. Several Panel members also felt that the appendices should include a list of all available program materials, from whom they may be obtained, and their cost.
- The name, address, and phone number of the Project Director or some contact person in the program should be included at the end of each case study.
- All of the Panel members felt that the case studies effectively described the operations of the two programs and considered the reports well-written.

The NIE Project Officer, however, suggested substantial changes in the case studies including greatly reducing the overall length; substantially reducing or eliminating information related to program history, administrative organization and costs; and deleting appendices.

4.1.2 Case Study Outline Revisions

Since the recommended changes altered the scope and purpose of the case studies as envisioned by Abt Associates and the Audience Panel, a meeting was called with NIE and BEH staff to clarify the project goals and information requirements of potential users. While Abt Associates saw the case studies as decision-oriented in-depth documentations, NIE/BEH viewed the descriptions as awareness pieces highlighting interesting program features: the reader needed only sufficient information to decide whether or not to

contact the exemplary program for further information.

In response to NIE/BEH concerns regarding the length and substance of the case studies, Abt Associates developed a more simplified version of the original outline. The revised outline described below was intended as a flexible guide responsive to the wide variations among the programs described.

The case study outline was substantially altered in order to (1) lead the reader immediately into the programs operations and (2) greatly reduce project-specific information. Part Two: Program Description (goals, history, program organization) and Part Six: Program Costs were deleted. Salient information from these sections were abstracted and presented in a new Introduction including "Overview" and "Context of the Program" subsections. All appendices were eliminated or incorporated into the body of the text. The following simplified outline was developed and approved:

Part One:	Introduction
Part Two:	Program Operations
Part Three:	Notable Features
Part Four:	People in the Program
Part Five:	Evaluation
Part Six:	Recommendations and Further Information

Part Two: Program Operations describes the major program components including classroom schedules, curriculum materials, teaching strategies, special services and so forth. Part Three highlights one or more notable features of each program -- whatever they may be (parent involvement, dissemination, teacher training, or data recording systems, for example). Notable features were selected by the Abt field staff in conjunction with the local program staff. Part Four: People in the Program includes sections on students, staff, parents and community involvement. The student section includes demographic data and information on selection and recruitment, placement, and follow-up services. The staff sections typically describe key staff positions and staff qualifications, pre- and in-service training, staff recriutment, and volunteer participation. The parent section offers an overview of various parent involvement activities, while the community

section describes local resources available to the program and the program's linkages with special organizations and agencies. Part Five details the program's evaluation design and presents available findings for the 1971-1972 academic year. Part Six includes the program director's recommendations regarding replication; the name, address, and phone number of a person to contact for additional information; a list of materials available from the program and their cost.

All program descriptions were revised according to these guidelines; that is, case study length was reduced, appendices were eliminated and project-specific information greatly condensed. Most organization charts were eliminated, although some graphs, charts, and other support materials were included, where appropriate, to enhance the presentation of evaluation design and results, curriculum materials, teaching strategies, and so forth. A uniform outline was maintained although some variations were introduced to accomodate the unique characteristics of the programs described. The flexible approach adopted in preparing the final drafts resulted in a more economical presentation of critical program information. Specifically, interesting and unusual aspects of each program received the increased emphasis they deserve.

4.2 Case Study Preparation and Review Process

In order to ensure the preparation of accurate program descriptions comparable stylistically and substantively, yet sensitive to the variations among the programs, several review processes were implemented throughout the production and revision period. Each stage of case study preparation was closely monitored by both the Project Director and the Deputy Project Director, to insure uniform quality among the final studies.

Following each site visit, field staff were thoroughly debriefed by the Project Directors to ascertain whether accurate and complete data had been collected and to establish specific procedures for writing the individual studies. Selection of notable program features, problems

encountered in the field, and anticipated difficulties in completing the report were discussed in depth. The debriefing also served to assist field staff in selecting appropriate material for inclusion in the program description.

Each on-site field team assumed responsibility for preparing draft studies on their sites. In some cases writing responsibilities were shared by the two field staff, although it frequently proved more efficient for one team member to serve as the primary author for each study. The second team member would then act as a resource and review person to insure accuracy and completeness and to control for observer/writer bias.

Completed draft reports were then submitted to either the Project Director or the Deputy Project Director for an intensive review of conciseness, objectivity, relevance to the outline, and technical accuracy. In depth discussion of the draft were conducted with the authors to pinpoint weaknesses in the report and missing or incomplete information and to make recommendations, where necessary, for reorganization or rewriting of the material. The editor shared responsibility with the field staff for making all changes. The revised draft was then submitted to the Project Director for a second internal review process resulting in further refinement of the study.

Approximately one month following the on-site field visit, the final draft case studies were mailed to programs for review and comments. The case studies were accompanied by a cover letter requesting project staff to assess the acceptability and accuracy of the report and to make changes as necessary. This review process was also used by Abt Associates as a vehicle for obtaining additional information in those instances where data gaps were discovered during the write-up process. Programs were asked to return the case studies with their comments and recommendations within a one-month period. Without exception, the programs expressed great satisfaction with the case studies; only minor corrections were required.

The fourth review and editing process was conducted by an outside editor with extensive prior experience in preparing similar manuscripts for publication -- especially in the areas of child care and other social service programs. In addition to typical editorial responsibilities, the outside editor assumed the task of substantially revising all the case studies according to the guidelines presented in Section 4.1. She also served as an objective reader providing a critique of each report and making recommendations for further improvements.

A particularly important and critical aspect of the review process was the continued input of the field staff who authored the initial draft reports. They maintained on-going contact with the sites and reviewed all comments and recommendations for revisions made by the program. The field staff were also responsible for reviewing the final version of case studies produced by the outside editor. Since the final editing process involved extensive revisions and in some cases the deletion of a considerable body of information and illustrative materials from the text, the staff were asked to carefully compare the original draft (submitted to the programs for review) with the final edited versions. This procedure was considered extremely important to ensure that critical information had not been deleted or that extensive editing did not result in a distortion or misrepresentation of program objectives, teaching strategies, entrance and screening requirements and so forth.

4.3 Problems Encountered During Case Study Preparation

Abt Associates developed a framework for data collection and a Case Study Outline which was felt to address the information needs of the potential audiences. The Outline and sample case studies were reviewed and approved by a consultant panel representing those audiences and by some BEH staff as well. As discussed in Section 4.1, it became evident over the course of the project, however, that Abt Associates and NIE/BEH held somewhat divergent views regarding the purpose of the case studies and the information needs of potential users. Abt Associates saw the program descriptions as in-depth

documentations; NIE/BEH envisioned the program descriptions as awareness pieces that described interesting program features. Since site visits were completed and most case studies were in production before substantial revisions were requested and finalized, extensive modification of the studies was required.

Abt Associates feels that in future studies of this type, it would prove useful for the client and contractor to specify very clearly at the outset their perceptions of the project's goals and the intended final outputs. These clarifications should be discussed in depth at initial project start-up meetings. Potential problems or misunderstandings might also be identified earlier and avoided if test results and sample program descriptions are reviewed before the major field effort is scheduled.

5.0 Abstracts of Case Studies and Program Comparison Chart

The seventeen case studies produced under this contract are presented in three separate volumes representing the three categories of programs studied: manpower education, early childhood education, and career education. These include three manpower training programs for personnel who work with handicapped children; six career education programs for the education of secondary and post-secondary special needs students; and eight early childhood programs for young handicapped children from birth to eight years. In each of the three categories, the final program selected represent a wide range of service delivery mechanisms; client populations with special needs; teaching strategies; curriculum materials; support services and so forth. Programs included are both urban and rural; state-wide and local; university based and public school based. In order to provide the reader with some insight into the major aspects of the programs selected, the scope of their operations, and their unique or notable features, a program comparison chart is presented in this section (p. 32), followed by abstracts of each case study (p. 36). General characteristics of the seventeen exemplary programs are highlighted below.

- Manpower Education Programs

Manpower programs range from a highly intensified 10-month program for eight experienced teachers to a state-wide uniform training program for over 300 university students and teaching and administrative professionals. Teaching strategies and materials include workshops, seminars, practical experiences, self-instructional media packages and individualized instructional modules. Among the notable features are a computerized system to assess trainee progress and achievement and a detailed professional competencies list for personnel working with mentally retarded high school students.

- Career Education Programs

The career education programs represent an equally diversified sample of educational programs for secondary and post-secondary handicapped students including the mentally retarded, learning disabled, deaf and hearing impaired, emotionally disturbed, culturally disadvantaged and many others. All of the programs offer integration opportunities for the special needs

students in mainstream classes and other regular high school programs; many offer pre-vocational exploration experiences, vocational evaluation, and specific job training with a focus on the development of proper work attitudes, social and interpersonal skills and related academic skills. Curricula include simulated work experiences in school, on the job training in the community, extensive use of film and video tape for both orientation and evaluation; and individualized and self-paced instructional materials.

- Early Childhood Education Programs

The early childhood programs included in this study are similar in some respects: most have developed individualized prescriptive program models with a strong emphasis on behavior modification and continuous assessment of pupil performance. Program size, service delivery modes, support services, training and dissemination techniques, and administrative auspices, however, vary considerably. The final sample, for example, includes full-day classroom-based programs, home-based programs, and programs offering simultaneous placement in regular preschool or K-1 programs. While most programs serve children with a wide range of handicapping conditions, several specifically address the needs of the multiply-handicapped, the emotionally disturbed, the hearing impaired, or children who would not be accepted by other programs. Approximately half the programs operate under the auspices of local school districts or cooperative school agencies, while the remainder are housed within university research and experimental centers. Among the notable features highlighted in the case studies are staff recruitment and training, parent involvement programs, demonstration and dissemination techniques, behavioral assessment guides, data recording instruments, evaluation models and curriculum materials.

What follows are a comparison chart (Section 5.1) highlighting the major dimensions of programs studied and a brief overview of each of these programs organized under the following rubric:

5.2 Manpower Education Programs

5.3 Career Education Programs

5.4 Early Childhood Education Programs

5.1 PROGRAM COMPARISON CHART

PROGRAM/PROJECT	TYPE	AGE OF STUDENTS SERVED	HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS SERVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	*KEY STAFF POSITIONS	INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM	YEARS OF OPERATION	**NOTABLE FEATURES
The Diversified Occupations Professionals Development Program Burlington, Vermont	Manpower	Undergraduates, graduate students, and secondary school personnel	Training to work with educable mentally retarded high school-aged students	320	State Project Director, University Project Director, Project Coordinator, 30 part-time consultants	Full-year university courses, in-service workshops and summer institutes in both special and vocational education	3	Statewide and uniform training program designed to meet Vermont's needs; professional competencies list
The Mark Twain Teacher Internship Program Rockville, Maryland	Manpower	Teachers with 1-7 years of experience	Training for work with children suffering from learning and emotional problems	8	Competency Area Coordinators, Competency Area Planners, Academic Instructors, Practicum Supervisors	Ten-month performance-based Internship Program to help experienced teachers gain competency for work with emotionally handicapped children	2	A viable alternative to higher education for training teachers integrating practicum and seminar learning experiences
The Clinical Teacher Model Project Tallahasee, Florida	Manpower	B.A. and M.A. candidates	Training to work with mildly handicapped children, including educable mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, learning disabled	35	Project Director, Clinical Professor, Project Evaluator	Individualized, performance-based program designed to produce competency in the areas of observation, diagnosis, intervention and evaluation	4	Individualized Instructional Modules; Computerization of information on student progress
Project Worker Fullerton, California	Career Education	Grades 9-12	Educable mentally retarded, learning disabled, orthopedically handicapped	220	Work Experience Counselor, Television Technical Advisor, plus School District personnel: Director of Exceptional Pupil Services, Coordinator of Instructional Materials, Coordinator of Vocational Education	Pre-employment and job-skill training involving the extensive use of video tapes for orientation, employment facilitation, performance evaluation	4	Extensive use of video-taped materials for student practice and evaluation
Vocational Village Portland, Oregon	Career Education	14-21	Emotionally, mentally and physically handicapped; socially, economically, academically, culturally disadvantaged	454	Testing Coordinator, Admissions and Evening Supervisor, Work Experience Coordinator	Personalized, career-oriented education offering classes in both basic academic and vocational areas; day, evening, and summer sessions	3	Job Sheets (individualized, hour-long instructional modules in basic and vocational education)

* All program staff are not listed here. Only unusual positions that may be indicative of special program features are included. For the most part, typical administrative and clerical support staff have been excluded from this category.

** Notable Features were selected by the program staff in conjunction with Abt Associates personnel.

PROGRAM COMPARISON CHART

PROGRAM/PROJECT	TYPE	AGE OF STUDENTS SERVED	HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS SERVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	*KEY STAFF POSITIONS	INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM	YEARS OF OPERATION	**NOTABLE FEATURES
Project SERVE St. Paul, Minnesota	Career Education	14-21	Educable mentally retarded, special learning and behavior problems	437	Teacher/Job Coordinators, Vocational Rehabilition Counselors, plus school district special services personnel	Combines half-day individualized instruction in vocational education and job-related activities with carefully monitored outside work experience	2	The SERVE Concept of state interagency cooperation (Vocational Rehabilitation, Vocational Education, Special Education); the SERVE Center
The Technical Vocational Program for Deaf Students St. Paul, Minnesota	Career Education	Average 19.5 years; post secondary	Deaf and hearing impaired	98	2 Counselors, 3 Preparatory Program Teachers, Chief Interpreter and interpreting staff, Counselor for the Handicapped, Media Specialist	Daily 12-week Preparatory Program to help students in initial social, vocational and academic adjustment; followed by enrollment in regular vocational courses	4	Effective mainstream integration, made possible through support services, including interpreting, counseling, note-taking, tutoring, and auditory training
The Career Development Center, Syosset, New York	Career Education	15-21	Social, emotional and cognitive problems causing inability to function in a normal school setting	280	Curriculum Teacher, Reading Teacher, Speech Therapist, 6 Lead Teachers, 3 Guidance Counselors, 2 Psychologists, 2 Social Workers	A daily program offering academic, vocational and elective components within decentralized Mini-Schools	4	Vocational Clusters Concept (clusters composed of several kinds of career and life skills training within one Mini-school)
The Mobile Unit for Vocational Evaluation Towson, Maryland	Career Education	10th grade students in Baltimore County	Intellectually limited	150	Director (County Supervisor of Special Education), Vocational Evaluator, Aide	One-week evaluation of student's employment potential by exposing him or her to a simulated work environment in the mobile unit	3	Coordination between mobile unit evaluation and other vocational education programs in the county
The Rutland Center Athens, Georgia	Early Childhood Education	2-14	Severe emotional/ behavioral and developmental problems	73	Coordinator of Psychoeducational Services, Coordinator of Evaluation, Coordinator of Field Services, 12 Lead Teachers, 12 Support Teachers, 12 monitors	Part-time classes from 2-5 days per week; children simultaneously enrolled in regular school, day care, etc. classes	3	Developmental Therapy Concept: Psychoeducational approach to therapeutic intervention for disturbed children

* All program staff are not listed here. Only unusual positions that may be indicative of special program features are included. For the most part, typical administrative and clerical support staff have been excluded from this category.

** Notable Features were selected by the program staff in conjunction with Abt Associates personnel.

PROGRAM COMPARISON CHART

PROGRAM/PROJECT	TYPE	AGE OF STUDENTS SERVED	HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS SERVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	*KEY STAFF POSITIONS	INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM	YEARS OF OPERATION	**NOTABLE FEATURES
The Chapel Hill Training/ Outreach Program Chapel Hill, North Carolina	Early Childhood Education	3-8	Mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, learning disabilities, speech impairment	7 demonstration class children; 400 public school, day care, and Head Start Personnel	Family Services Coordinator, Special Education Coordinator, Behavioral Psychologist, plus volunteers.	Daily instructional program including individualized prescriptive learning experiences. Outreach Project disseminates techniques through workshops, training packages, and on-site consultation	4	Learning Accomplishment Profile (LAP) which permits assessment of child, establishment of behavior objectives, and planning of an individualized instructional program
The P.E.E.C.H. Project (Precise Early Education of Children with Handicaps) Champaign-Urbana, Illinois	Early Childhood Education	3-5	Mulitply handicapped (hearing and visual impairment, neurological, language and speech problems, behavioral/ emotional disturbance, etc.)	20	Program Evaluator, 3 Disseminators, 3 Parent Coordinators, Motor Development Specialist, 2 head teachers, 4 paraprofessional teachers, speech and recreation students	Daily instruction using a diagnostic teaching approach with emphasis on individualized programming and behavior modification	3	Parent Program; Dissemination Efforts
The Magnolia Preschool Program Magnolia, Arkansas	Early Childhood Education	5	Educable mentally retarded, speech and hearing problems, emotionally disturbed	30	Project Director (also Director of Education, Magnolia Public Schools), 2 Consultant Evaluators, Parent Coord., Speech Therapist, Social Worker	Daily classroom program using a team teaching approach; individualized and small group instruction. Outreach teacher training program	4	Staff Recruitment and Training
The UNISTAPS Project Minneapolis, Minnesota	Early Childhood Education	birth-6	Deaf and Hearing-impaired	65 (and families)	Interdisciplinary Team consisting of communicologist, social worker, school health representative, and 3 parent tutor/ counselors	(1) Local-Level program offering infant training to parents and 6 kinds of pre-primary classes for parents and children (2) State-wide training preschool personnel	3	Family Education and Involvement, with focus on parent counseling, guidance and education

* All program staff are not listed here. Only unusual positions that may be indicative of special program features are included. For the most part, typical administrative and clerical support staff have been excluded from this category.

** Notable Features were selected by the Program staff in conjunction with Abt Associates personnel.

PROGRAM COMPARISON CHART

PROGRAM/PROJECT	TYPE	AGE OF STUDENTS SERVED	HANDICAPPING CONDITIONS SERVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS	*KEY STAFF POSITIONS	INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM	YEARS OF OPERATION	**NOTABLE FEATURES
The Portage Project Portage, Wisconsin	Early Childhood Education	birth-6	Mentally retarded, physically handicapped, speech and language impaired	65	5 Home Teachers Training Coordinator, Evaluation Coordinator	A home-based program which uses a prescriptive, behavioral curriculum to train parents to teach their own children	4	Precision Teaching Model which pinpoints behavioral objectives and uses daily and weekly data to insure the achievement of these objectives
The Model Preschool Program Seattle, Washington	Early Childhood Education	birth-6	Communication disorders, Downs syndrome	135 direct, 400 indirect (through field efforts)	Director, Co-Director, 3 Instructional Coordinators, 2 Communications Specialists, Representative from BEH/OCD (for field operations), support staff including Admissions Coordinator and Evaluator, plus volunteers	Daily Preschool A and B (A for severely handicapped children, B for less severely handicapped); Communication Preschool for children with hearing and communications handicaps; the Downs Syndrome Program for infants and preschoolers	3	Behavioral Data Collection and Assessment; Field Efforts (training for day care, Head Start, and public school personnel)
The Preschool and Early Education Project Starkville, Mississippi	Early Childhood Education	4-7	Educable mentally retarded and more severely handicapped	53	University Professor in Special Education/Project Director, Demonstration Teacher, Evaluator, Speech Therapist, Social Worker	A daily program of compensatory education with focus on intensive language development and perceptual growth activities	3	Outreach: Resource/Replication Efforts

* All program staff are not listed here. Only unusual positions that may be indicative of special program features are included. For the most part, typical administrative and clerical support staff have been excluded from this category.

** Notable Features were selected by the Program staff in conjunction with Abt Associates personnel.

5.2 Abstracts of Manpower Development Programs

5.2.1 Clinical Teacher Model Project
Tallahassee, Florida

The Clinical Teacher Model Project (officially called Preparation of the Clinical Teacher for Interrelated Areas of Special Education) was developed in the College of Education, Department of Habilitative Sciences at Florida State University in Tallahassee, Florida, and is currently being field-tested there. The individualized instructional system trains teachers to deal with mildly handicapped children, including the educable mentally retarded, learning disabled, and emotionally disturbed. Students who graduate from the program receive their bachelor's and master's degrees simultaneously, as well as a teaching certificate in special education from the State of Florida. The Project will graduate its first master's interns at the end of the 1973 academic year, and currently has 15 juniors, 10 seniors and 10 master's degree candidates.

Underlying the Project's instructional system is the philosophy that certain academic and social behaviors or skills can be identified which will enable the mildly handicapped child to succeed in a regular classroom, regardless of his particular disability. In turn, certain basic competencies are required for the teacher to allow him or her to deal equally successfully with children with a range of handicapping conditions. The Project has identified necessary pupil skills in language, pre-reading, reading, pre-math, mathematics and social areas. Required competencies for the Clinical Teacher include observation, diagnosis, intervention, and evaluation.

One of the notable features of the Clinical Teacher Model program is the framework of the instructional program, which is based on individual modules. Each module provides the trainee with objectives, instructional activities, and criteria for demonstrating competencies. Students confer with the staff Clinical Professor to select the performance criteria and resources to be used for each module according to their own needs, and then progress independently at their own rate of speed. Tied in with this

framework is another notable feature, which is the computerization of information about the student's work. Data on each individual's progress through the modules and through the entire program are stored and reported by the computer, which provides weekly printouts for both staff and students.

5.2.2 The Diversified Occupations Professionals Development Program
Burlington, Vermont

The Diversified Occupations Professionals Development Program trains education professionals for Vermont's Diversified Occupations (D.O.) Program, which provides career-oriented education to high school-aged mentally retarded students. The Professionals Development Program was designed to sensitize D.O. professionals to the needs of their handicapped students and to provide them with vocational and special education skills.

As D.O. programs have become operational in each of Vermont's ten Area Vocational Centers, it has been necessary to recruit qualified personnel to staff D.O. Labs--specially designed and well-equipped classrooms which offer a variety of vocational education courses and which act as a halfway step for students in their transition from segregated settings to integrated classrooms. Because personnel seldom have the necessary backgrounds in both vocational and special education skills, the Vermont Department of Education enlisted the support of the University of Vermont's (UVM) Vocational Education and Technology Department (VOTEC) to create a D.O. Professionals Development Program which would offer specialized training for those already teaching D.O. students and would prepare UVM students for future careers in the D.O. Program.

At present, approximately 340 people are participating in the program. Trainee involvement ranges from full- and part-time undergraduate and graduate study at UVM to in-service training meetings, week-end workshops, summer institutes and training courses.

One notable feature of the program is its Professionals Team Concept, a multiple approach to Vermont's manpower needs. This concept has led the staff to develop a standardized instructional program adaptable to a whole spectrum of professionals who function in the educational sector and the community. Another notable feature is the D.O. Professional Competencies

List, which delineates over 200 skills needed by various educators in areas such as planning of instruction, guidance, etc., and which can be used as an ongoing evaluative instrument for both trainees and staff.

5.2.3 The Mark Twain Teacher Internship Program
Rockville, Maryland

The Mark Twain School in Rockville, Maryland, serves 200 students of average or higher intellectual ability, ages 11 to 19, with learning or emotional difficulties. Complementing the Mark Twain School are a variety of Mark Twain programs in public schools which provide special help for students and consultation to staff. A primary aim of the Mark Twain School-Based Programs is to train teachers to deal with children in a variety of settings. Mark Twain staff believe that student growth and progress hinge on the skill, sensitivity and flexibility of faculty members. Service to pupils is seen as intertwined with staff development: one is partner to the other.

The Mark Twain Internship Program is a 10-month effort which is currently training eight participants. Still in the development phase, the program uses a performance-based curriculum to help already experienced teachers achieve competency in five basic areas: psychoeducational assessment; human relations and counseling; curriculum development and implementation; behavior management; and systems analysis and consultation. Interns participate in seminars, individualized instruction, and practica at both the Mark Twain School and at one of 12 public schools offering Mark Twain Programs. The programs are of two types: a Student Resource Teaching model and an Instructional Team model. Interns spend at least one of three 11-week learning sequences in one of these two programs, and at least one at Mark Twain School: the third sequence depends on the intern's future teaching plans. Staff feel the Internship's practicum feature offers experienced teachers a viable alternative to university-based higher education.

Perhaps the most notable feature of the Mark Twain Internship Program is its possibility for serving as a viable alternative for higher education for the training of teachers who work with special children. The internship system is not meant to replace university training, but can serve as

one more possibility for post-graduate education. The primary characteristic which distinguishes the Mark Twain program from university-based training is its emphasis on the integration of practicum and seminar learning experiences.

5.3 Abstracts of Career Education Programs

5.3.1 The Career Development Center
Syosset, New York

The Career Development Center (CDC) in Syosset, New York, is an alternative high school program serving between 250 and 300 students ages 15 to 21 drawn from 56 local public school districts in Nassau County. CDC is a transitional program which aims to help students who cannot adjust to, or function in, their local public school settings. Students return to their own schools when they have developed a capacity for independent living.

CDC offers a secondary education free of many of the restraints and demands of the students' home schools, a flexible, experimental program responsive to individual needs. A wide variety of alternative components is available -- work-study, work cooperative, recreational excursions, art, music groups, and so on -- from which the student can assemble his own program and schedule. The several campus buildings in which CDC is located are divided into seven units, sometimes called Mini-Schools. Each student is assigned to a Unit and participates in occupational and academic learning activities. Elective subjects are pursued away from the Unit.

CDC sees Career Education not only as specific skill training but also as the development of proper work attitudes, human relations skills, orientation to the world of work, alternate career choices and actual job acquisition. The program invigorates academic subject areas by stressing their practical aspects. The process of education at CDC is more important than the skill training product.

The Career Development Center regards guidance and direction for its students as crucial: students are immersed in a therapeutic environment whether they're in class, walking across the campus, in a formalized counseling session, or participating in an after-school program. All staff members are oriented to the needs of their students and see each encounter with young people as a chance to provide warm and trusting relationships. Further, staff members

try to observe students in a variety of settings -- with other students, with parents, with other adults -- in order to better understand and help them.

A notable feature of the Career Development Center has been its development and implementation of the concept of vocational clusters. Each of the seven Units within the center contains a different vocational cluster, which is composed of several different kinds of occulational training. Students may explore one, two or all of these occupations in the unthreatening atmosphere of their own Units. Different ability levels are designed within each occupation, and students are placed in the Unit most closely matching their interests and abilities.

5.3.2 The Mobile Unit for Vocational Evaluation

Towson, Maryland

The Mobile Unit for Vocational Evaluation assesses the employment potential of over 150 mildly mentally limited students enrolled in special-education classes throughout Baltimore County, Maryland. The 48-foot-long van visits 15 comprehensive high schools, with special education programs, scattered across the 607-square-mile area surrounding the city of Baltimore. The Mobile Unit primarily serves tenth-grade special education students, although it also visits junior high schools and schools for the severely mentally limited and orthopedically handicapped when needed.

The Mobile Unit demonstration project is intended to provide more specific direction for educators in individualizing pupil instruction in the classroom, facilitating pupil placement in in-school and community work-training programs, and reducing the dropout rate of 16-year-old students who may leave school for economic and other reasons. By uncovering abilities not apparent in the classroom setting, the Mobile Unit for Vocational Education attempts to provide the teacher with realistic appraisals of the work potential of students while encouraging youngsters to explore job possibilities or training which can lead to satisfactory work placement.

The Mobile Unit assesses a student's abilities, aptitudes, and limitations by exposing him or her to a simulated work environment in the van. Evaluation of student employment potential is based on psychometric tests, work samples, and observation of work behavior. The Unit's Vocational Evaluator and Aide prepare a report on each student's performance during his one-week attendance in the trailer, evaluating the student's ability, aptitude, and tolerance in relation to the world of work and providing a functional analysis of vocational potential.

The evaluation report may include social, medical, and/or psychological recommendations which alert the professional community to a student's special needs. In addition, the report identifies for the student his or her areas of vocational potential, emphasizing perhaps for the first time the positive aspects of each student as a valuable individual.

One of the programs most notable features relates to the fact that Mobile Unit activities are coordinated with a series of ancillary programs in Baltimore County, such as the Community-Centered Work Experience Program, in a system of comprehensive services for evaluating, rehabilitating, training, and counseling each special-education student for a productive adult life.

5.3.3

Project SERVE
St. Paul, Minnesota

SERVE is a vocationally-oriented high school program serving approximately 437 educable mentally retarded students, students with special learning and behavioral problems and other special needs in the St. Paul, Minnesota area. The program is designed to prepare students in Grades 10 through 12 for job placement upon graduation and to develop work habits and social skills required for self-sufficiency and total integration into the community. The SERVE model emphasizes, where possible, the normalization and integration of the handicapped student as he moves into the mainstream of secondary education and ultimately into a competitive work environment.

A special classroom in each high school is the locus of activity for half the school day. Here, a Teacher/Job Coordinator works with approximately 15 students to carry out an individualized program in vocational education and job-related academic and social activities. Most SERVE coordinators avoid traditional curricula and learning materials that frequently prove irrelevant to their students' needs and abilities. Rather, instruction focuses on practical activities and often includes everyday materials such as newspapers, recipes, etc. During the second half of the day, students are scheduled for on-the-job training in a semi-sheltered environment (for younger students) or in the community (for more advanced students), or they take specific job training at the area vocational high school.

One of the program's most notable aspects is the concept of interagency cooperation upon which it is based. SERVE is an acronym for three state agencies -- Special Education, Rehabilitation, and Vocational Education -- and is intended to symbolize their combined efforts in the support and implementation of local SERVE programs. Since 1970, the SERVE concept has been implemented in 14 St. Paul school districts and has been translated into specific state-wide guidelines for establishing and funding similar programs in the public school system. Another notable feature of the program is the SERVE Center, which has recently been established at the

area vocational high school, Intermediate District 916 Vo-Tech Institute. The Center's aim is to involve students with vocational handicaps in all training programs offered at the Institute, and to serve any student enrolled in the Institute who demonstrates the need for special help.

5.3.4

Project Worker
Fullerton, California

Project Worker of Fullerton, California, attempts to bring together the teenaged handicapped job seeker and the world of work by providing educable mentally retarded, educationally handicapped (learning disabled), and orthopedically handicapped high-school students with job-entry skills. Students learn how to locate jobs in the community, job interview techniques, selected job skills, and perform on- and off-campus job training. Project Worker's primary goal is not merely job placement for handicapped students, but placement in better jobs with higher skill levels and pay than are traditionally available for these students.

The program serves approximately 220 students (grades 9 through 12) in the Fullerton Union High School District (encompassing the Los Angeles suburbs of Buena Park, Fullerton, La Habra, Lowell, and Yorba Linda). Not a self-contained program, Project Worker is incorporated into 23 special-education classes in eight high schools throughout the District. The program is highly flexible and the extent to which individual classes incorporate the Project Worker program varies considerably, depending for the most part on the teacher's attitude toward vocational education. As understanding and support for vocational education grows, so does Project Worker.

A notable feature of the program is its extensive use of video-tapes for on-campus pre-employment instruction, orientation training in specific job skills, employment facilitation and performance evaluation. For example, pre-employment training uses role-playing with the teacher acting as potential employer. These sessions are video-taped and played back for critique purposes. Tapes demonstrating performance of various types of on-the-job tasks are accompanied by appropriate student materials (sales tax charts, etc.), and teacher manuals which include the relevant job description, a list of necessary equipment and materials and their sources, the behavioral objectives of the lessons, training procedures, forms for evaluation, etc. Specific tools and machines lent by companies are also used for student practice.

5.3.5 The Technical Vocational Program for Deaf Students St. Paul, Minnesota

The Technical Vocational Institute's Program for Deaf Students (TVID) is a post-secondary training program for deaf and hearing-impaired students located in the St. Paul Area Technical Vocational Institute (TVI), one of Minnesota's 33 Area Vocational Institutes. The program aims to demonstrate the feasibility of using an existing institute which customarily serves hearing students to train post-secondary deaf students as well. In addition, it seeks to reverse the traditional underemployment of deaf students which has resulted from a severe lack of post-secondary training facilities. The TVID Program, located in a modern, well-equipped facility, is currently helping some 98 deaf and hearing-impaired young people with an average age of 19.5 years pursue advanced vocational and technical training with wide selection and flexibility in their studies.

The TVID Program consists of a 12-week Preparatory Program designed to help deaf students in their initial social, vocational, and academic adjustment. Once this program has been completed, the student is ready to select a field of concentration in one of the 38 regular TVI courses in trade and industrial, technical, business and distributive, health and service areas. Alternatively, the student may enroll in other programs offered at other local post-secondary facilities, including vocational institutes and colleges.

Perhaps the most notable feature of the TVID program is its emphasis on the integration of deaf students into regular classrooms to help prepare them for future job and social roles in the hearing world. The Preparatory Program plays a major role in successful integration efforts, as do the various supportive services offered by TVID, including counseling, interpreting, note-taking, tutoring and auditory training. In addition to these supportive services, the program offers students a host of extra-curricular activities which allow interaction between hearing and deaf students in a natural and informal setting. Concurrently with TVID, a Media Program is developing specialized media for handicapped students.

5.3.6

Vocational Village
Portland, Oregon

Vocational Village offers personalized, career-oriented education to young people ages 14 through 21 who live in the Portland (Oregon) Public School District. It serves a total of 454 high school dropouts, youngsters referred by penal institutions and the courts, and those transferred from regular high schools because of physical, mental, or emotional problems. For most of the kids in the program, Vocational Village is the last chance to overcome a life pattern of chronic failure and underachievement. The program is dedicated to helping economically and educationally disadvantaged youth become independent, responsible and productive citizens through guidance and counseling, supportive programs, an interdisciplinary curriculum of basic and career-oriented education adjusted to individual needs, and placement and follow-up services.

Vocational Village is based on the assumption that every student is as worthy as his successful counterpart in the traditional high school setting, and every student has the potential for success if given personalized education opportunities. The program offers alternative channels for students which include G.E.D. preparation, certified entry-level occupational competencies programs, and/or a high school diploma.

One of the notable features of the Vocational Village program is its individualized method of instruction, which is based on the completion of Job Sheets. These are single, short tasks which are to be performed independently by the students and which can be sequenced into entire instructional units. Because Job Sheets are designed to take the student progressively closer (in small, less threatening steps) to skill acquisition, students may begin an instructional unit at varying levels of difficulty, depending on their ability upon entry into the unit.

5.4 Abstracts of Early Childhood Education Programs

5.4.1 The Chapel Hill Training/Outreach Program
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

The primary goal of the Chapel Hill Outreach Project (formerly the Chapel Hill Preschool Project) is to provide early education intervention for young developmentally handicapped children throughout the state of North Carolina. Seven children between the ages of three and eight receive direct services in the Project's demonstration classroom housed with the Division for Disorders in Development and Learning (DDDL) on the University of North Carolina campus. The major thrust of the Project, however, is to reach out to thousands of handicapped children across the state and to promote change in the community through intensive training programs for kindergarten-to-third-grade teachers and for North Carolina's Head Start and day-care personnel. Now in its fourth year, the Project provides technical assistance and conducts workshops for more than 400 professionals and paraprofessionals, extending to them the methods, materials, and curriculum developed and tested during the Project's three years as a demonstration preschool program.

The Project's educational approach emphasizes individual prescriptive programs for both children and their families. Techniques demonstrated in the classroom and presented in training sessions include behavioral assessment, establishment of developmentally appropriate objectives, task analysis, and the systematic use of reinforcement. Practical materials developed by Project staff include a 45-week curriculum guide and a Learning Accomplishment Profile (LAP).

The Project has been able to extend its outreach services to programs in eight regions across the state and, at the same time, to continue its direct service component by bringing together the coordinated resources of many agencies and educational institutions including the North Carolina Council on Developmental Disabilities, the University of North Carolina, the Chapel Hill-Carrboro public school system and North Carolina's Technical Institutes.

A notable feature of the Chapel Hill Outreach Project is its practical approach to educational intervention and the extension of this approach to untrained child care personnel. A focal point of the program -- both within the classroom and within the training workshops -- is the Learning Accomplishment Profile (LAP), a developmental assessment device that can be used by untrained paraprofessionals as well as professionals to establish individual pupil objectives and to program appropriate activities and materials for each child.

5.4.2 The Magnolia Model Preschool Program

Magnolia, Arkansas

Located in a predominantly rural area in southwestern Arkansas, the Magnolia Model Preschool Program for Handicapped Children maintains two classrooms designed specifically for 30 five-year old children with a variety of handicapping conditions including mental retardation, developmental retardation, speech and hearing problems, and emotional disturbances. The Magnolia project uses a diagnostic teaching approach with emphasis on individualized programming and behavior modification to prepare these students for entry into regular school programs. By intervening early in the life of the handicapped child, the Preschool is designed to enhance development in the areas of language and communication skills; perceptual and motor skills; social skills; and school readiness skills such as numbers, alphabet, matching, and listening.

Housed in a public school building, the Preschool operates in conjunction with five kindergarten classes for the non-handicapped. Because of the program's emphasis on integration of handicapped children into normal settings, some non-handicapped children are placed in the special kindergarten, and interaction between regular and special classrooms is encouraged.

Careful and realistic planning structured the program to fit its rural setting. Established as part of the Magnolia Public School system, children are accepted into the program from two counties encompassing 10 school districts. The program offers four services: an instructional program; special services; a parent involvement program; and staff training. Under a newly-acquired Bureau of Education for the Handicapped grant, the program also seeks to prepare public school teachers and administrators and day-care personnel to receive handicapped children in their classes.

A notable feature of the program is its training of local people for work with handicapped children. Rather than seeking out already qualified

special education teachers from outside the area, the program uses extensive pre- and in-service training to compensate for any initial lack of experience with handicapped children among its staff. In-service training opportunities provided by the program include attendance at professional workshops and conferences, visits to other programs, presentations by consultants, discussions of teaching techniques at weekly staff meetings, and supplementary college courses for which the program pays tuition.

5.4.3 The Model Preschool Program

Seattle, Washington

Seattle's Model Preschool Program, affiliated with the University of Washington, is a training, research and service project for children ages birth to 6 with a wide range of handicaps. The project is attempting to demonstrate that with a behavior modification approach, any sound curriculum can be used to help handicapped children. The program indirectly serves more than 400 children through its field efforts, and directly serves 135 students in the following kinds of classes:

- Preschool A and B Program

Preschool A serves severely handicapped children with minimal or no social skills. These are children who have been considered impossible to manage, test, or diagnose and who have been unable to continue in the programs they were previously enrolled in. Preschool B combines less severely handicapped children with normal children who serve as models.

- Down's Syndrome Program

Providing infant, early and advanced classes for children with Down's Syndrome, this program is designed to enable trainable children to function independently in a non-institutional environment. Early intervention is seen as critical for the success of these children.

- Communication Preschool

This program helps children improve their communication and language skills. There are two classes, one for children with hearing impairments, the other for children with speech or language impairments. With the former type, staff use a diagnostic approach to determine whether an acoustically handicapped child will profit most from a verbal or verbal-manual program.

One notable feature of the program is its extensive collection and assessment of behavioral data for each child. Continual data are recorded on

children's behaviors by teachers, trainees and parents, and these measurements of child progress form a useful basis for further teaching activities. Of paramount importance in each of the data collection systems is the fact that each behavior has been operationally defined, thereby minimizing subjective interpretation by the observor. Another outstanding feature of the Model Preschool Program is its field efforts, which provide training, guidance and consulting services to other projects serving handicapped children, particularly Head Start, day care centers, and public schools.

5.4.4 The P.E.E.C.H Project

Champaign-Urbana, Illinois

The primary goal of the P.E.E.C.H. Project (Precise Early Education of Children with Handicaps) is to demonstrate and disseminate model procedures for developing and implementing a preschool program for young handicapped children and their families. The secondary, service-oriented goal of the project is to provide 20 multiply-handicapped children with an early education program which will prepare them to function in the educational system at a higher level than would have been possible without intervention.

The children served by the P.E.E.C.H. Project are between the ages of three and five. All of the children function at a mentally retarded level and have one or more secondary handicapping conditions (e.g., hearing and visual impairment, neurological, language and speech problems, potential learning disabilities, behavioral problems and emotional disturbances) which have typically excluded them from other preschool or day care services. The Project aims to develop each child's maximum potential while increasing parental abilities to understand, accept and teach their handicapped children. P.E.E.C.H. staff, in an effort to reach their goals, have formulated a program based on early intervention; individualized instruction; behavioral change through positive reinforcement; diagnosis, precise planning and evaluation; low teacher/pupil ratio through the use of paraprofessional staff; ongoing staff development; and close contact with the public schools which accept P.E.E.C.H. children.

One of the notable features of the P.E.E.C.H. Project has been its successful dissemination effort, which is carried out by a Dissemination Coordinator and two part-time Disseminators on staff. These staff members demonstrate P.E.E.C. H. activities to visitors from private and public agencies throughout the state and country. Another notable feature of the Project is its Parent Program which seeks to encourage maximum participation and involvement of the parents through parent-staff group meetings, home visits, three-way (parent, child and teacher) conferences, classroom observation and classroom participation.

5.4.5 The Portage Project
Portage, Wisconsin

The Portage Project is a home teaching/parent involvement program for handicapped children ages birth to 6 years living within a 3600-square-mile rural area in south central Wisconsin. The major thrust of the Project is to train parents to teach their own children at home, using a precision teaching model. The curriculum is prescriptive, behavioral, and planned for each child depending on his present skills and the home environment. Further, the program is data-oriented, emphasizing precise and accurate recording of objectives, activities, and outcomes. Under the guidance of a training and evaluation resource team, a Home Teacher visits each family weekly for about an hour and a half to prescribe specific activities to be taught during the coming week, demonstrate how to teach and record the desired behavior, and observe the parents' teaching techniques. For the remainder of the week, the parent becomes the child's teacher, performing the prescribed activities every day and recording the child's successes and failures. Each of the Project's five Home Teachers serves between 13 and 15 children: current enrollment is 65 youngsters.

The Portage Project staff are also engaged in a wide-reaching dissemination and replication effort which includes pre- and in-service training for pre-school program staff, technical assistance to programs replicating the Portage model, training sessions in the precision teaching model, and presentations on all aspects of the Project before professional groups. The replication effort specifically emphasizes that the home-based and precision-teaching models can be adapted to a variety of settings, urban and rural, for all children whether handicapped or not.

The most notable feature of the Portage Project is, in fact, its precision teaching/behavior modification model, which enables parents to act as the primary teachers of their children in a systematic way. The model is a set of sequenced steps to be followed by parents and Home Teachers; the steps include pinpointing behavioral objectives, recording baseline data

for each objective, precise scheduling for each task to be learned, and recording post-basal data to determine whether or not the behavior has been accomplished.

5.4.6 The Preschool and Early Education Project Starkville, Mississippi

The Preschool and Early Education Project (PEEP) for Children with Developmental and/or Language and Perceptual Problems currently serves 53 children ages four through seven. Located in Starkville, Mississippi, the Project is sponsored by Mississippi State University in cooperation with the Starkville Public Schools and the Mississippi State Department of Education. The Project serves primarily educable mentally retarded children, although a few students are more seriously disabled. All suffer from language and perceptual problems.

PEEP offers a daily program of compensatory education in classrooms at two Starkville elementary schools. The Project's chief focus is intensive language development and perceptual growth activities, often implemented through art, music and physical education. One of the major objectives of the Project has been the development of a curriculum appropriate for its students. Thus far, the staff have produced two teaching manuals, one on art and one on language development that have been distributed to many educators in Mississippi and other states. Units within these manuals present a brief overview of the skill to be learned and provide numerous activities for teaching the skill, with an emphasis on low-cost or home-made materials. Parent involvement is an important aspect of the PEEP program, and the staff have also produced a booklet which helps parents teach their children various behaviors. In addition, child-centered workshops are held for parents each week.

The most notable feature of the PEEP program has been its dissemination of curriculum innovations and teaching methods, and the replication of its model program in day-care centers and public schools throughout the state. The Director and Demonstration Teacher travel throughout Mississippi, distributing and explaining program materials and methods and demonstrating program techniques. To date, some 20 Mississippi sites have participated in PEEP resource/replication activities.

5.4.7 The Rutland Center

Athens, Georgia

The Rutland Center of Athens, Georgia, is a model program serving 73 children between two and fourteen years of age with severe emotional or developmental problems. Some 23 children, ranging in age from two to eight, are considered preschoolers. The Center's major goal is to decrease the severe emotional and behavioral disorders of children through a psychoeducational treatment process called Developmental Therapy.

Children are enrolled in therapeutic classrooms organized according to five levels of maturity. Specific objectives are established in four curriculum areas -- behavior, communication, socialization, and academics -- for each developmental level and for each child. The program also seeks to integrate the disturbed child into the mainstream of normal experiences. Children attend classes at the Center for only one or two hours a day and from two to five days a week, with frequency and length of participation decreasing as the child moves from class Level I to Level V. At the same time, most children (except those in Level I classes) are simultaneously enrolled in a regular elementary school, kindergarten, nursery, or day-care center.

Rutland Center also conducts a half-way kindergarten both for children who have finished at the Center but are too young for public schools and for preschoolers who need some special attention, but not as much as those in therapeutic classes. In addition, the Center operates an Infant Program at the community Well-Baby Clinic, diagnosing infants from three months to two years of age and helping parents plan home stimulation programs to remedy developmental lags. Besides the child service component, the Center also offers services to parents and a staff training program.

The State of Georgia has selected Rutland Center as the prototype for a Georgia Psychoeducational Center Network which is a part of a statewide

system of community mental health centers. In order to carry out this effort, the University of Georgia supports a technical assistance office at the Rutland Center to train staff at new centers and help them with proposal writing, planning, etc.

The most notable feature of the Rutland Center program is its adherence to the Developmental Therapy concept. This concept dictates that the treatment process should be a developmental progression in which the elimination of pathological behavior and the stimulation of developmentally appropriate behavior are closely akin to normal growth. Developmentally suitable experiences are systematically used in the therapy program to stimulate constructive behaviors, and non-constructive behaviors are redirected or extinguished.

5.4.8

The UNISTAPS Project
Minneapolis, Minnesota

UNISTAPS is a demonstration project for preschool hearing-impaired children from birth to six years and their families, operated by the Minnesota State Department of Education. The Project currently offers comprehensive service to 85 hearing-impaired children and their families through the Minneapolis public school system. Program aims include comprehensive evaluation of each child; development of the child's reliance on spoken language as a normal means of communication; strengthened parent-child relationships; community awareness of resources for the hearing-impaired; and incorporation of program principles and practices into university teacher training programs. The UNISTAPS acronym is derived from the project's participating agencies: UNIversity of Minnesota, STAte Department of Education, Minneapolis Public Schools.

The Project offers children and their parents a variety of program options including individual tutoring/counseling sessions, small group nurseries and kindergartens in self-contained and integrated settings. An interdisciplinary staff team designs an individually prescriptive oral and aural program for each child and his family. The primary focus is on a home-centered, parent-guided, natural language approach to learning, using a sequenced curriculum developed by UNISTAPS staff.

As the preschool program has become established, the Project Director has launched statewide dissemination efforts through workshops, parent institutes, and professional growth experiences for personnel who serve the hearing-impaired. Staff are also assisting state officals with replication of the UNISTAPS model for application to all Minnesota preschoolers regardless of handicapping condition.

The most notable feature of the program is its emphasis on family education and parent involvement. UNISTAPS is committed to the principles that "parents are the child's first and best teachers; the home is the most

appropriate learning environment; and daily activities are the most vital sources of language input for young children." There are several ways the program actively involves parents and other family members, including: individual parent teaching sessions led by a parent tutor/counselor; weekly mothers' groups and monthly fathers' groups; a ten-week child management course; and a Pop-In-Parents Program in which mothers who are graduates of the program visit new parents.

6.0 Recommendations for Further Study

The successful completion of this project paves the way for additional research and training related to the education of the handicapped. Several recommendations for further study are outlined below, based upon the experiences and insights gained during the course of this study. While these recommendations are merely intended to be suggestive of the direction future research may take, Abt Associates would be pleased to develop specific and detailed recommendations for executing these efforts.

6.1 Technical Assistance in Development and Application of Selection Criteria

A major phase of the study consisted of refining selection criteria and developing procedures for applying those criteria across widely divergent programs. The problems encountered in conducting that phase are detailed in Section 2.0 of this report.

In view of continuing interest in the identification of exemplary or model educational programs for national dissemination, Abt Associates believes that the experience gained through this project and similar BEH/NIE projects completed or in progress can be documented for use by other researchers. Specifically, we suggest that alternative selection procedures be examined in depth and that guidelines and recommendations be drafted for developing both performance standards criteria and relative effectiveness criteria. Seminars or workshops involving this contractor, contractors engaged in similar efforts, BEH and NIE staff, and other interested parties could be conducted to address the basic issues relative to selection procedures and criteria such as sample size, evidence of effectiveness, initial and final screening methods, cost effective methods of validating evaluation outcomes.

6.2 An Assessment of the Information Requirements of Potential Program Replicators

Abt Associates proposes a follow-up analysis of the dissemination of the case studies produced under this contract and, where feasible, of previous dissemination projects, in order to assess the uses made of the disseminated information and to identify additional information needs of potential or current program replicators. To carry out this effort, a mail survey based on NIE/BEH

subscribers or mailing lists is proposed to:

- identify what audiences have requested the model program series;
- determine how the brochures have been used by potential replicators and other respondents;
- assess what kinds of information proved most useful and least useful; and
- determine what additional information needs exist.

Alternatively, the model programs included in the dissemination effort could be surveyed to determine the number of persons who contacted the program for further information; what resources were made available to potential replicators by the program; how many replications ensued and what, in fact, was replicated. Abt Associates feels that information of this nature might potentially be extremely valuable in shaping future dissemination efforts.

6.3 Development of In-Depth Replication Manuals

This recommendation constitutes an expanded approach to this dissemination and replication effort. While the program descriptions prepared under this project provide the potential replicator with an overview of successful program components, the studies are not sufficiently detailed to guide program operators in actually implementing any of these components. We feel that substantial additional information and/or technical assistance must be made available to program operators and other audiences to assist them in deciding what to replicate and how to replicate. Inputs, processes, and outcomes of alternative models must be clearly delineated: the goals and objectives of the programs; the processes (environmental, experiential, special services, etc.) involved in realizing those outcomes; and the associated inputs (staff, training, client population, physical facilities, financial and community resources, etc.)

Many programs included in this study are now providing such in-depth information to replicators; many have received state or federal funds specifically for this purpose. Typically, model programs facilitate replication by hosting on-site visits by the replicators, providing technical assistance at the replication site, training teachers, offering administrative assistance, distributing program materials and training in their use, and so forth. Often replication requires on-going support from the model program throughout the planning and

implementation period. Limited resources, however, would prevent the model programs from extending this direct assistance, information, and materials to a much greater number of replicators.

In order to facilitate replication on a larger scale, we suggest that consideration be given to the development of "how to" manuals or self-instructional packages inlcuding in-depth information on planning, procedures, materials, costs, personnel, training strategies and other activities involved in start-up and on-going program operation. To assess the feasibility of "packaging" alternative approaches to the education of the handicapped, a prototype manual could be developed in conjunction with an exemplary program that is currently engaged in intensive replication efforts and has already developed an extensive amount of replication materials including video-tapes, training and curriculum materials, etc. This package could then be field tested on a limited number of sites to test its utility and to make specific revisions in content and format.

6.4 Develop and Disseminate Information Packages on Alternative Approaches to Parent Involvement, Staff Training, Evaluation and Other Common Program Components

This recommendation is essentially an outgrowth of the "notable features" concept used in the preparation of the case studies. It suggests an alternative method of organizing and presenting information for dissemination--by functional program component rather than by project.

While some replicators may be interested in adopting a model program in toto, practitioners operating well-established programs may be primarily interested in improving a specific service delivery component or a single program facet. An alternative to the individual program description would be a series of manuals, each focusing on a single aspect of program operations common to early childhood programs, for example. The manuals would document several different approaches to functional program components such as staff training, parent programs, administration and management, fund raising, curriculum development, and the use of volunteers. This method of presentation would offer the practitioner a single volume in a specific interest area, rather than a series of individual studies. Preparation of each manual would require identification of a sample of programs with, for example, notable parent programs, and subsequent on-site observation and data collection.

7.0 Appendices

7.1 Original NIE/BEH Selection Criteria With Initial Revisions by Abt Associates

7.2 Final Revised Criteria List and Weightings

7.3 Telephone Survey

7.4 Programs' Percentage Score According to Program Category

7.5 Case Study Field Guide

7.1 Appendix A:

Original NIE/BEH Selection Criteria With Initial Revisions by Abt Associates

7.1 Appendix A: Original NIE/BEH Selection Criteria With Initial Revisions by Abt Associates

General Criteria

a. The program must have clearly stated objectives and must be able to present measurable evidence of the achievement of those objectives through both collected data and program operation. The program's objectives should be stated in concrete measureable terms; ideally, the programs should have pre- and post-measurements of the achievement of those objectives. Programs, however, should not be screened out of the selection if their data is concurrently in the process of being collected, as opposed to already complete.

b. The project must be replicable, that is able to be adapted in settings of various characteristics. Ideally, there should be programs in different kinds of settings which have modelled themselves in part or in total after the BEH projects. However, projects which have not as yet replicated but whose components seem potentially replicable (reasonably staffed at reasonable costs, for example) should not be screened out.

c. Evaluation strategies must be components of the program, and have been applied in a continuous process. We assume here that there are a variety of kinds of evaluation strategies which might be components of the programs -- evaluations of students in the programs, evaluations of the projects as a whole, evaluations by parents, by staff, by outside consultants, etc.

d. The project must have been in existence for a sufficient period to demonstrate success and give every indication that it will continue to operate in 1972-73. In general, we would assume that a program would have to be in operation at least 8 months in order to demonstrate success and indicate plans for operation in 1972-73.

NOTE: Underlined sections represent Abt Associates' expansion or clarification of the original selection criteria.

General Criteria (Continued)

e. Cost data should be available in a per student breakdown and evidence the program's adaptability. Ideally, programs should have cost data readily available in per student breakdown categories. However, programs should not be screened out if, although the data is not readily available, it can be easily converted into student breakdowns.

f. There must be assurance of the willingness of local project personnel to cooperate in furnishing necessary material and in having information on their program disseminated nationally.
S.E. (Self-explanatory)

Additional General Criteria

g. The comprehensiveness of the program should be evidenced in a broad range of program components and services which are designed to meet the needs of the students, parents, and community in which the program operates.

(NOTE: for manpower programs, comprehensiveness would be defined by the program's ability to prepare trainees to meet the needs of children, parents and communities in which they will work).

h. Programs should have low staff-student ratios; a core staff who are employed by the program and work with the students on a regular and continuous basis; and a low turnover of paid and volunteer staff.

i. Programs should give evidence of operating under a set of goals that meet the needs of the students served and give evidence of an underlying philosophical framework.

j. Programs should have established relationships with agencies and organizations in their communities which help to improve their services and/or enhance the community itself.

Early Childhood Education Criteria

a. The program should have already been replicated.

There should be programs which have modelled themselves in part or in total after the BEH project.

b. There should exist a cooperative development of efforts between for example, the State Department of Education, Institution of higher education and a private agency. Coordination with the local school is required.

We interpret the terms "cooperative development" and "coordination" to cover a wide category of activities -- for example, cooperation and coordination in project planning, funding, evaluation procedures, referral and placment procedures, etc.

c. The project must include parent and family activites and participation as well as services to them.

S.E.

d. The comprehensiveness of the program should be evident by its mental, physical, social, language, and emotional components.

We assume the term comprehensiveness refers to the scope of curriculum offered in the program, and the scope of services offered to the participants as well as to their families where relevant.

e. All projects must have evaluations for (1) the progress of the children and (2) the success of each program component (inservice training, parent participation, etc.)

Ideally, programs should have already collected data according to their evaluation design on the progress of children and the success of each program component. However, programs that do not yet have conclusive data in all of these areas but are presently in the process of collecting this information, should not necessarily be screened out.

Early Childhood Education Criteria (Continued)

f. Each project must serve children from birth to eight years.

Restated: Each project must serve children within the range of 0-8 years. This may be a non-criterion, since all Early Childhood Education Programs, by definition, serve children between 0-8.

g. There must be input in terms of staff and/or consultants from both special education and child development/early childhood education.

S.E.

h. There must be at least a 10% contribution in terms of dollars from local sources.

S.E.

i. Each project must have an inservice training component.

Manpower Development Criteria

a. The project must be an innovative approach to the solution of major training problems.

S.E.

b. The program must be concerned with the training of a specialist in special education at the baccalaureate or graduate level.

S.E.

c. The project must have a detailed evaluation design.

S.E.

d. The projects must be designed to conceptualize, implement and evaluate on a trial basis, programs for the preparation of personnel to educate handicapped children which are basically new or which are significant major modifications of existing programs.

S.E.

Career Education Criteria

a. The students should graduate from the program with job entry skills.

S.E.

b. A job placement service that has coordination with community needs should be part of every project.

S.E.

c. A follow-up system should be established.

S.E.

d. Provision for retraining should be made when and where necessary.

S.E.

e. Each project should have a vocational counseling component.

S.E.

f. There should be adequate diagnostic instruments for predicting student potential

S.E.

Full Services Criteria

a. Each project shall provide, within itself or within the educational program which is supplemented by the project, direct instructional services to eligible handicapped children.

S.E.

b. Major objectives of the project must be stated in terms of expected changes in the achievement and performance of a specified group of handicapped children.

S.E.

Full Services Criteria (Continued)

c. Projects must be of sufficient size, scope, and quality to assure substantial progress toward meeting identified major needs of participating children.

As discussed in our July 17 meeting with you, it was felt that concrete standards of "sufficient size, scope, and quality" for Full Service programs have not as yet been operationally defined. As suggested by Dr. Mueller, we intend to develop general ranges for this criterion after reviewing all of the Full Service programs selected in the sample of 50. That is, these standards can only be defined relative to the programs which currently exist. We will develop standards of "sufficient size" and "scope" after we know the general sizes of the Full Service programs and their scopes of operation.

d. There must be evidence that each project has been planned in coordination with other agencies (local, State, and other Federal programs and agencies), and that provision has been made for participation of handicapped children from non-public schools.

We feel that this criteria ought to be broken into two separate criterion.

d.1) There must be evidence that each project has been planned in coordination with other agencies (local, State, and other Federal programs and agencies).

d.2) Provision must be made by the program for participation of handicapped children from non-public schools.

Regarding part 2, and as discussed at our meeting with you, this criterion may in fact be a non-criterion since it is required in the legislation that all Full Service programs make provisions for the participation of non-handicapped children from non-public schools.

7.2 Appendix B:

Final Revised Criteria List and Weightings

7.2 Appendix B: Final Revised Criteria List and Weightings

	General Criteria	Weighted Criteria
(o)	a. The program must have clearly stated objectives and must be able to present measureable evidence of the achievement of those objectives through both collected data and program operation. The program's objectives should be stated in concrete measureable terms; ideally, the programs should have pre- and post-measurements of the achievement of those objectives. Programs, however, should not be screened out of the selection if their data is concurrently in the process of being collected, as opposed to already complete.	3
(o)	b. The project must be replicable, that is, able to be adapted in settings of various characteristics.	3
(o)	c. Evaluation strategies must be components of the program and have been applied in a continuous process. We assume here that there are a variety of kinds of evaluation strategies which might be components of the programs -- evaluations of students in the programs, evaluations of the projects as a whole, evaluations by parents, staff, outside consultants, consumers of the services, etc.	3
(o)	d. The project must have been in existence for a sufficient period of time to begin to evaluate success; project must give every indication that it will continue to operate in 73-74.	3
(o)	e. Cost data should be available in a per student breakdown and evidence the program's adaptability. Ideally, program should have cost data readily available in per student breakdown categories. However, programs should not be screened out if, although the data is not readily available, it can be easily converted into student breakdowns.	2

KEY

o = Criterion remains as originally stated.
r = Criterion has been restated, reclarified, and/or expanded upon.
e = Criterion has been eliminated for reasons stated.
a = New Criterion has been added.
i = Criterion already included elsewhere in statements.

	General Criteria (Continued)	Weighted Criteria
(o)	f. There must be assurance of the willingness of local project personnel to cooperate in furnishing necessary material and in having information on their program disseminated nationally.	3
(o)	g. The comprehensiveness of the program should be evidenced in a broad range of program components and services which are designed to meet the needs of the students, parents, and community in which the program operates. (NOTE: for manpower programs, comprehensiveness would be defined by the program's ability to prepare trainees to meet the needs of children, parents and communities in which they will work).	3
(e)	h. Eliminate	
(a)	new h. The determination of the needs of students, and the determination of the program goals and components should be ongoing processes involving the inputs of staff, parents, consumers, community representatives, and specialists.	3
(e)	i. Eliminate	
(r)	j. Programs should have established reciprocal relationships with agencies and organizations in their communities which meaningfully help meet the needs of the students being served.	3
	Early Childhood Education Criteria	
(e)	a. Eliminate -- rules out programs of recent vintage; is not necessarily an indicator of exemplariness.	
(i)	b. Already included in General Criterion j.	
	KEY o = Criterion remains as originally stated. r = Criterion has been restated, reclarified, and/or expanded upon. e = Criterion has been eliminated for reasons stated. a = New Criterion has been added. i = Criterion already included elsewhere in statements.	

	Early Childhood Education Criteria (Continued)	Weighted Criteria
(o)	c. The project must include parent and family activities and participation as well as services to them.	3
(o)	d. The comprehensiveness of the program should be evident by its mental, physical, social, language, and emotional components. We assume the term comprehensiveness refers to the scope of curriculum offered in the program, and the scope of services offered to the participants as well as to their families where relevant.	3
(i)	e. Already included in General Criterion c.	
(e)	f. Eliminate -- early childhood programs, by definition, serve children within this age range.	
(i)	g. Already included in General Criterion new h.	
(r)	h. The program must have reasonable plans for continuation at the termination of BEH funding.	3
(r)	i. Each project must have a staff development program which allows for and helps develop mobility between staff positions based on performance and competencies.	2
(a)	j. The program should offer each child those opportunities and skills necessary to develop as normally and as fully as possible leading to full integration of the child into regular school and community life.	3

KEY

o = Criterion remains as originally stated.
r = Criterion has been restated, reclarified, and/or expanded upon.
e = Criterion has been eliminated for reasons stated.
a = New Criterion has been added.
i = Criterion already included elsewhere in statements.

	Manpower Development Criteria	Weighted Criteria
(r)	a. (and d. combined) The projects must be designed to conceptualize, implement, and evaluate on a trial basis, programs which approach the solution of major training problems such as the development of: cost-effective training methods competency-based instruction programs which train teachers as creators of educational environments rather than as technicians or consumers of educational media programs which train teachers for new roles within classrooms (e.g. resource teachers, itinerant teachers, etc.) training programs which are relevant to and able to be implemented on the LEA level.	3
(e)	b. Eliminate -- limits the possibilities of training para-professionals, special education "generalists", etc.	
(i)	c. Already included in General Criterion c.	
(i)	d. See a. (Included in that statement).	
	Career Education Criteria	
(r)	a. Programs should prepare students to their maximum potential so that they are able to integrate into their community with as many of the social, vocational and daily living skills as possible.	3
(r)	b. The job training program and placement services should be coordinated with and closely related to the manpower needs of the community.	2
	KEY o = Criterion remains as originally stated. r = Criterion has been restated, reclarified, and/or expanded upon. e = Criterion has been eliminated for reasons stated. a = New Criterion has been added. i = Criterion already included elsewhere in statements.	

	Career Education Criteria (Continued)	Weighted Criteria
(r)	c. (and d. combined) The follow-up and retraining system should be operative so that it contributes meaningfully to the evaluation of the training for purposes of developing and modifying the program.	2
(i)	d. (Already included in c. above).	
(r)	e. Each project should have counseling components which help meet the individual's total life situation.	2
(r)	f. There should be an ongoing-evaluation of student needs and progress in order to assess and guide the development of the program.	3
	Full Services Criteria	
(o)	a. Each project shall provide, within itself or within the educational program which is supplemented by the project, direct instructional services to eligible handicapped children.	2
(i)	b. Already included in General Criterion c.	

KEY

o = Criterion remains as originally stated.
r = Criterion has been restated, reclarified, and/or expanded upon.
e = Criterion has been eliminated for reasons stated.
a = New Criterion has been added.
i = Criterion already included elsewhere in statements.

	Full Services Criteria (Continued)	Weighted Criteria
(o)	c. Projects be of sufficient size, scope, and quality to assure substantial progress toward meeting identified major needs of participating children. As discussed in our July 17 meeting with BEH, it was felt that concrete standards of "sufficient size, scope, and quality" for Full Service programs have not as yet been operationally defined. As suggested by Dr. Mueller, we intend to develop general ranges for this criterion after reviewing all of the Full Service programs selected in the sample of 50. That is, tnese standards can only be defined relative to the programs which currently exist. We will develop standards of "sufficient size" and "scope" after we know the general sizes of the Full Service programs and their scopes of operation.	2
(i)	d. 1) Already included in General Criterion j.	
(o)	d. 2) Provision must be made by the program for participation of handicapped children from non-public schools,	1
(i)	e. 1) Already included in General Criterion c.	
(i)	e. 2) Already included in General Criterion f.	
(a)	f. The program should provide each student with those skills and opportunities necessary for maximum integration into the mainstream of society (e.g., social, educational, vocational skills).	3

KEY

o = Criterion remains as originally stated.
r = Criterion has been restated, reclarified, and/or expanded upon.
e = Criterion has been eliminated for reasons stated.
a = New Criterion has been added.
i = Criterion already included elsewhere in statements.

7.3 Appendix C:

Telephone Survey

7.3 Appendix C: Telephone Survey

CASE TELEPHONE SURVEY

CONTACT SHEET

TYPE OF PROGRAM: _____

Name of Program: _____

Address: _____

_____

Telephone Number: _____

Name of Director: _____

Call #1: Date: Time:

Outcome:

Call #2: Date: Time:

Outcome:

Call #3: Date: Time:

Outcome:

Unacceptable Dates for Site Visit: _____

Most Acceptable Dates for Site Visit: _____

CASE TELEPHONE SURVEY

Program Name: _____

Type: _____

Name of Telephone Interviewer:

_____

I. Directions for Interviewing the Program Director

Our major objective in conducting this telephone survey is to collect enough information to enable us to select twenty (20) Bureau of Education for the Handicapped programs from the initial sample of fifty (50) who are included in the telephone survey. It is most important for maintaining smooth relations with the field that you follow the procedures outlined below:

Step # 1.

By the time of your phone call, the Director should have received word from OE and/or the State Education Agency of their inclusion in the initial sample of fifty (50) sites, and of a forthcoming phone call from Abt. However, begin the phone call by introducing yourself and the study very briefly, as follows:

> "Hi. My name is _____ and I'm calling from Abt Associates in Cambridge, Massachusetts. We were recently awarded a contract by the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the Office of Education to Document Exemplary Programs for Education of the Handicapped, and your program has been included in an initial sample of fifty (50) programs by BEH, as an example of one of the best in it's field. (pause)
>
> You probably have been notified by BEH that we would be calling you and should have received our letter describing our survey. (pause)
>
> I would like to ask you some questions -- but I realize that you may be very busy right now. Is this a good time or would you like me to call back later or would you like to call me back collect whenever it is convenient for you?"

(If call back later, find out day and time and record on Contact Sheet).
If time is convenient proceed with survey as follows:

> "At the present time we are trying to find our some basic information about the fifty (50) programs; specifically, what, if any, exemplary or notable elements each program has, so that we will be able to narrow down our sample from fifty (50) to twenty (20) programs. These twenty (20) programs will then be visited by us for about three (3) days so that case studies can be written about each of them for national dissemination. We are selecting the twenty (20) programs by reviewing each of the programs' files at the Office of Education in Washington, D. C., as well as through a telephone survey, which is what I would like to go through with you now. (pause)
>
> Do you have any questions before I begin?"

Answer them and proceed with interview following page.

CASE TELEPHONE SURVEY

Program Name: _____

Type: _____

Name of Telephone Interviewer:

_____

II. Questions for All Programs

1. Could you briefly describe your program's components?

2. What is the range of handicaps served?

Type of Handicap	Estimated Percentage of Students in Program

3. a) Could you briefly describe your program's objectives?
   b) How are these objectives determined? Who is involved?
   c) Have your program objectives changed over time? If so, how and why?

4. a) What does the program consider to be the major needs of the students in your program?
   b) Who determines those needs?
   c) Have those needs changed over time and, if so, how did you know?
   d) Was your program modified to meet those changing needs? If so, how?

5. What is the total number of students in your program?

6. a) How long has the program been in operation?
   b) Do you plan to be operative in 73-74?
   c) What are your plans for carrying on the program at the termination of BEH funding?

7. What are the paid positions and volunteer positions in your program?

   a) Staff positions: Full Time Part Time

   TOTAL

   b) Volunteer positions: Full Time Part Time

   TOTAL

   c) Where do the volunteers come from?

8. Can you tell us off-hand, what your staff-student ratio is?

9. a) What is the estimated racial or ethnic distribution in your program? (If they have percentage distributions, get those figures. If they only have numbers of students, get that information and we will convert it into percentages).

   Students: Staff:

   b) Are the incomes of your students' families distributed across economic levels (low, middle and high) or does your ptrogram primarily serve only one income level?

10. What is the sex distribution? (Same procedure for percentages as in Question 9).

students: Males_____ Females_____

staff: Males_____ Females_____

11. What is the age distribution of students in your program? (Same procedure for percentages as in Question 9).

12. Can you describe what goes on in a typical program day?

13. What do you feel is especially notable about your program -- what aspects of it would you consider to be exemplary?

14. a) Do you feel that these exemplary aspects can be replicated by another program with similar characteristics to yours? (Explain)
b) With different characteristics than yours? (Explain)

15. a) Do you have an evaluation design for your program? (Please describe)
    b) Has this design been applied continuously throughout the program? (If so, when)
    c) Who evaluates the program?
    d) What kinds of evaluation data have you collected?
    e) Would this be available to us if we were to visit your program?
    f) Have any evaluation findings caused you to make changes in your program?

16. a) Do you have pre- and in-service training programs for staff? Please describe how often it is held and what topics it covers.
    b) Do you have any provision in your program for staff development (e.g. mobility between job levels, competency-based career ladders, etc.)

17. What types of linkages or contacts with the community does your program have? For example:

a) Who refers students to your program?
b) Where are students placed after they leave the program?
c) What other agencies and organizations do you have contacts with?
d) In what ways do these contacts help meet the needs of the students served? Please describe.

18. a) Is there provision in your program for integrating your students into normal settings? Describe.
b) What skills does your program provide to help prepare students for daily living in the mainstream of society?

NOTE: QUESTIONS 19 and 20 SHOULD NOT BE ASKED OF THE MANPOWER PROGRAMS

19. Do you have any of the following kinds of parent participation?

a) parent volunteers in the program;
b) parent education classes;
c) parent meetings;
d) parent-staff conferences;
e) other.

20. If you have any of the above kinds of participation, please describe how many parents are involved, how often, in what kinds of activities.

21. Do you keep records on the students in the program? (Describe the kinds of information included in them and the frequency with which they are recorded).

22. Who is responsible for planning the program?

23. a) Have other programs modeled themselves after your program in its entirety or have certain components been replicated by any other programs? (If yes, what program and which components were replicated)
    b) (If yes, what role did you and your staff play in facilitating this replication?)

24. a) What is your per student cost? (If not sure, ask 24b)
    b) Could this information be made available at a later time?

25. Do you utilize a sliding scale for tuition or do low income families pay less than middle income families in your program?

26. a) Does your program publish reports or other materials? (Please describe)
    b) Have articles or feature stories ever been published about your program?
    c) Could these materials be made available to us now (by mail) or at the time of our visit if your program were selected?

CASE TELEPHONE SURVEY

Program Name: _____

Type: _____

Name of Telephone Interviewer:

_____

EARLY CHILDHOOD CRITERIA

EC 1. Do you have any type of cooperation arrangement with the following? Please describe.

a. The State Department of Education

b. An Institution of Higher Education

c. A private agency

d. The Public School System

e. Other

EC 2a. Does your program account for the mental, physical, social, language and emotional needs of the students served? If so, how?

b. Are any services offered by the program to meet the students' mental, physical, social, language and emotional needs? to meet the family needs?

EC 3. Could you describe your method of evaluating:

a. the progress of the students

b. the success of each program component (please list components)

EC 4a. Do you employ staff with the following educational backgrounds?

Number of Staff

1) special education

2) child development

3) early childhood education

Total Staff:

b. Do you employ consultants who have backgrounds in special education, child development, and/or early childhood education?

EC 5a. Do you have any local funding?

b. If so, by what sources?

c. Is 10% or more of your program funded by local sources?

CASE TELEPHONE SURVEY

Program Name:_____

Type:_____

Name of Telephone Interviewer:

_____

CAREER EDUCATION CRITERIA

CE 1. a. What are your criteria for graduating students from the program?

b. Does your program concentrate on vocational skills or does it offer training in social and daily living skills as well? Describe.

c. What kinds of jobs are students prepared for? Describe the necessary skills for each.

CE 2. a. Do you have a placement service as a component of your program?

b. What type of coordination exists between the placement service and the employers in the community?

c. How do you find out what the community employment needs are so that students can be placed?

d. Which of your staff are involved in the placement of students? Describe their roles.

CE 3. a. Do you have a follow-up system for graduates placed in jobs?

b. (If so) which of your staff are involved in the follow-up process?

c. Could you describe when and how the follow-up system operates?

d. Have the results of your follow-up system caused you to make any modifications in your program? If so, describe.

e. Are there records about this system that could be made available to us?

CE 4. a. Do you have occasion to provide re-training for graduates?

b. (If yes) how do you find out that re-training is necessary?

c. In how many instances has it been necessary to retrain a graduate?

d. For what reasons?

CE 5. a. Does your program offer counseling components? Describe.

b. How many students in tne program receive counseling?

c. How often?

CE 6. a. Do you use any diagnostic instruments for predicting student potential?

b. How are the results of the tests used and by whom?

CASE TELEPHONE SURVEY

Program Name:_____

Type:_____

Name of Telephone Interviewer:

_____

MANPOWER CRITERIA

M 1. Do you feel that any aspects of your program are innovative approaches to the solution of major training problems? (Please describe both training problems and associated innovative solutions.)

M 2. Is your program concerned with training "specialists" in special education at the baccalaureate or graduate level? (If yes, please describe the type of specialists trained and at what level.)

M 3. Is your program designed to prepare educators of handicapped children in ways that are basically new or which are major modification of existing training programs? (please describe)

CASE TELEPHONE SURVEY

Program Name:_____

Type:_____

Name of Telephone Interviewer:

_____

FULL SERVICES CRITERIA

FS 1. (If not already or fully answered in questions 1 and 2). Could you describe the direct instructional services provided to the students in your program?

FS 2. Are the major objectives of your project stated in terms of measurable and expected changes? (Please describe by giving some examples of major objectives.)

FS 3. a. Could you list what your project identifies as the major needs of its participating students?

b. Please describe how your major components meet those needs.

FS 4. Has your project been planned in coordination with any of the following agencies and programs? Please describe how they were involved.

a. local programs and agencies

b. state programs and agencies

c. other Federal programs and agencies

FS 5. Does your program provide for the participation of handicapped children from non-public schools? Please describe.

CASE TELEPHONE SURVEY

Program Name: _____

Type: _____

Name of Telephone Interviewer:

_____

Directions for Completing the Interview

When you have finished asking all of the written questions, ask the Director if there is anything about the program that we should know about but have not touched on in any of the questions. If so, please write that information below:

X1. Directors additional comments:

X2. How would you feel about having an Abt staff member spend approximately 2-3 days at your center observing the program and interviewing you and some of your staff for the purpose of the BEH case studies which will be disseminated nationally?

X3. (If no objections) We are hoping to make the selection of twenty (20) programs by _____ and to then visit each of the centers in _____. Are there any particular dates which would be unacceptable for a staff member to visit the program during this time? Are there any days which are more acceptable than others?

X4. If we do get to visit your program, are there any persons, outside of your program staff (such as principals of schools, community agencies, parent boards) that it would be helpful to talk to in order to learn about your program?

Thank her/him for spending time in the interview and say that we will be getting back in touch with them in the near future. Make it clear that if they have any questions to feel free to call you at the Abt office number. Please be sure to complete the Rating Scales on the next page before making your next call.

CASE TELEPHONE SURVEY

Program Name: _____

Type: _____

Name of Telephone Interviewers:

_____

RATING SCALES

A. Exemplary Scale

1. Program seems to have exemplary element(s) which can be easily replicated _____

2. Program seems to have exemplary element(s) which are not replicable in any other programs _____

3. Program seems to have interesting though not necessarily exemplary element(s) which are replicable _____

4. Program does not seem to have interesting or exemplary element(s) worthy of study _____

B. Participation Scale

1. Program seems very eager to participate in study
2. Program seems willing to participate in study
3. Program seems willing, but has some reservations about participating (Explain)
4. Program seems negative about study (Explain)

7.4 Appendix D:

Programs' Percentage Score According to Program Category

7.4 Appendix D: Programs' Percentage Scores According to Program Category

Manpower

1	Mark Twain Teacher Internship Program, Rockville, Maryland	100%
1.	Clinical Teacher Model Project, Tallahassee, Florida	100%
2.	Diversified Occupations Professionals Development Program, Burlington, Vermont	95.23019%
3.	Utah State University	76.1905%
4.	Boston College	71.4286%
5.	Southern Illinois University	57.1429%
5.	University of North Carolina	57.1429%
5.	Northwestern University	57.1429%
6.	University of Kansas	42.8571%

Early Childhood

1.	UNISTAPS Project, Minneapolis, Minnesota	100%
1.	Rutland Center, Athens, Georgia	100%
2.	Preschool and Early Education Project, Starkville, Mississippi	97.4359%
3.	Portage Project, Portage, Wisconsin	96.1538%
3.	P.E.E.C.H. Project, Champaign-Urbana, Illinois	96.1538%
4.	Georgetown Diagnostic Nursery, Washington, D.C.	93.5897%
5.	Magnolia Preschool Program, Magnolia, Arkansas	92.3077%
5.	Model Preschool Program, Seattle, Washington	92.3077%
6.	Chapel Hill Outreach Training Program, Chapel Hill, North Carolina	89.7436%
7.	Meyer Institute, Nebraska	85.8974%
8.	NYU Rehabilitation Center	67.9487%

Full Services

1.	Hearing Impaired, Duluth, Michigan	80.000%
2.	Snake River, Idaho	76.6667%
2.	Multi-Media Resource Center, Towson, Maryland	76.6667%
3.	Mott Children's Health Center, Michigan	75.000%
4.	Walworth Center Special School, Wisconsin	58.333%

Percentages (continued)

Full Services (con'd)

5.	Fairview Hospital TC, Oregon	48.333%
6.	Maryland School for Blind	43.333%
6.	Winnebago State Hospital, Wisconsin	43.333%
7.	Michigan School for Blind	41.6667%
8.	Resource and Development Center, Gulfport, Mississippi	36.6667%
9.	Wisconsin School for Deaf	28.333%

Career Education

1.	Career Development Center, Syosset, New York	93.1%
2.	Vocational Village, Portland, Oregon	88.889%
3.	Technical Vocational Program for Deaf Students, St. Paul, Minnesota	81.9%
4.	Project Worker, Fullerton, California	77.7778%
5.	Project SERVE, St. Paul, Minnesota	75.000%
6.	Mobile Unit for Vocational Evaluation, Towson, Maryland	75.000%
7.	Itawamba Junior College, Mississippi	73.6111%
8.	Sicklerville, N.J., Vocational Program	73.6111%
9.	Adams Township, Michigan	51.3889%
10.	Work Incentive Program, Laconia, N.H.	47.222%
11.	Work Evaluation Center, Florida	36.111%
12.	Project REACH, Caldwell, Idaho	30.556%

7.5 Appendix E:

Case Study Field Guide

7.5 Appendix E: Case Study Interview Guide

CASE INTERVIEW GUIDE

PART II PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

A. Goals:

- who developed the goals and objectives for the program?
- how were they decided upon?
- what procedures were used to develop them?
- have they been changed since the inception of the program -- if so, who initiated the changes and why?
- how central are the written goals and objectives to the everyday operation of the program? to the evaluation of the program?
- do you anticipate any goal changes in the future?

B. History

- how did the program get started?
- who were the original actors involved?
- what types of difficulties did you encounter in getting the program off the ground?
- what were the major events that helped shape the history of your program?
- what suggestions could you make to other programs just getting started -- e.g. short-cuts you learned, more efficient and effective means of operation, etc.

C. Program Organization

a) Sponsorship

- who are you funded by?
- how did you secure funding?
- what types of support (administrative, services, consultation) do you receive from your sponsor(s) in addition to financial support?
- what are your reporting procedures to your sponsor? What other ways must you account to your sponsor?

b) Administrative organization

- do you have an administrative organization chart? (If so, get a copy. If not, please draw one up in conjunction with interviewee which we can use in the case study.)
- has this particular organizational arrangement always been in effect or have there been changes over time?
- if so, what were these changes?
- what needs were these changes designed to meet?
- do you feel that this organizational arrangement is the most effective for your type of program, or is there another set-up which you would be more satisfied with?
- do you have any suggestions for other programs just starting up regarding administrative organization and relationships?
- which administrative relationships do you consider most essential to your program operations?
- any administrative changes anticipated in the future?

c) Policy-making relationships

- what have been some of the major policy decisions in your program?
- how are major policy decisions determined?
- who is involved in this process?
- is this a formal or fairly informal procedure?
- do staff, parents, community members play any role in developing policy?
- how do staff, parents, community members find out about major policy decisions made?
- do you have an advisory council or board? what role does it play in developing policies?

PART III PEOPLE IN THE PROGRAM

A. Students

a) demographic characteristics (should already know from the telephone survey -- however, it is a good idea to double check)

- what are the ages of the students served in the program?
- how many students does the program serve?
- what types of handicaps do the students have? how are they classified?
- what percentage of children come from low, middle and high income families?
- what ethnic/racial groups are represented, and in what proportion?
- have the characteristics of students admitted to the program changed over time or are any changes anticipated?

b) selection criteria and methods of recruitment

- how are the students recruited for or referred to the program (e.g. local pediatricians refer, schools refer, parent coordinator canvasses neighborhood, etc.)
- what are the selection criteria used for determining whether children are admitted into the program? -- e.g. most severely handicapped; first come - first served; welfare cases, etc.
- what is the procedure for admitting a student -- who sees her/him and what tests, interviews, etc. do student and parent go through before being admitted?
- how many students do you have to turn away each year? (approximately for what reason)?
- do you have a waiting list, if so, how many families are on it?
- any changes in selection and recruitment processes anticipated?

c) placement

- where are students placed upon completion of the program (in what kinds of settings -- schools, jobs, etc.)
- which staff and/or agencies are involved in this procedure?
- are students followed up after leaving the program? How? who is involved?
- any information on student's average length of stay in the program?
- any information on student "dropouts" from program -- reasons for leaving the program

B. Staff

a) job descriptions and positions

- how many staff do you employ?
- what staff positions are there?
- would you mind telling us the range of staff salaries?
- how many of your staff are part time?
- list of staff whose services are used by the program but are not paid for directly by the program--e.g. consultants from a university, staff from agencies, State Department of Education personnel, volunteers, etc.--and descriptions of the services they provide to the program.
- do you have a brief summary of the job responsibilities of each of the staff members? (if not, briefly go over each staff's job role)

b) role of volunteers

- do you utilize volunteers in the program?
- if so, what do they do?
- for the most part, where do your volunteers come from? (e.g., Junior League- parents, community people, senior citizens, etc.)
- how are they recruited?
- do you consider them a vital part of the program? in what ways?
- what training do you provide for them?
- have any volunteers ever become staff?

c) staff organization chart

- do you have a staff organization chart (if yes, get a copy and bring home -- if no, make one out with the interviewee and bring it back)

d) recruitment and selection of staff

- is someone in charge of recruitment of staff?
- how are staff recruited and from what sources?
- how are staff selected? what procedures do you use and what criteria do you employ for hiring staff?
- what is the staff turnover rate for the past two years?
- have you been satisfied with the type of staff you have been able to recruit or would you prefer different types of persons?
- any changes anticipated in the number and kinds of staff to be recruited and selected?

e) pre and in-service training

- do you have a pre-service training program?
- what staff are included in the training?
- how long does it take place and when?
- what type of training was provided this year? last year?
- who decides what types of training are to be given?
- who trains?

- do you have an in-service training program?
- how often is it held and which staff are involved?
- who decides what training is to be given?
- what topics do you plan to cover this year?
- who does the training?
- have the training needs of your staff changed over time? How?

C. Parents

a) demographic characteristics

- do you have information on how many two-parent families vs. how many one-parent families your students come from?
- what types of jobs do the majority of parents hold
- do many of the mothers work?

b) parent involvement activities

- are parents involved in the ongoing program operation and development? If so, how?
- for example, are parents or other family members involved in the following activities and how?

  classroom teaching
  parent education classes
  policy-making
  program evaluation
  other?
- how many parents are actively involved in the program? how often?
- how central do you see the role of parents in the operation of your program?

c) services offered to parents

- what types of services are offered to parents? e.g. parent education, parent therapy or communication groups, social work services, counseling, etc.
- what types of feedback do you provide to parents, re: student and program progress? e.g. individual meetings with parents, PTA, report cards, etc. newsletter

D. Community

a) community linkages and involvement

- what agencies and community groups do you have cooperative relationships with? Please describe.
- in each case, what services do you provide them? Do they provide to you?
- are community representatives involved in policy-making? evaluation? how?
- are community representatives involved in consultation to your program? how?
- other functions they serve?
- have there been changes over time in your relationship with the community? Please describe.
- how essential to the operation of your program are the linkages you have developed in the community? not essential, somewhat essential, moderately, crucial to the functioning of the program) Please explain.
- which relationships have been most beneficial? least beneficial?
- how is information abut the program disseminated to the community -- how visible is the program in the community?

PART IV: PROGRAM OPERATIONS

- what are the major components (or services or phases) of your program operation? (curriculum, health sevices, parent education, counselling, etc. or evaluation, job training and community placement)
- briefly describe each component
- are there any components or services you are presently not providing that you wish to develop?
- what have been the obstacles in providing these services?
- are there plans for providing these services in the future? How?

PART V: PROGRAM EVALUATION

a) evaluation objectives -- dimensions of the program evaluated

- which aspects of the program do you evaluate and how often? e.g. which components, curriculum, staff training, etc.

b) who evaluates and how often

- which staff member, (or parents, students, etc.) are involved in program and student evaluations
- how often does evaluation take place?

c) data gathering and forms

- how is the data gathered
- what form is it in presently (report, paper, raw form)
- do you keep records or formal evaluations on each aspect of the program you evaluate for comparative purposes over the year?

d) uses of evaluation data

- how is the data used? (e.g. for modification of program, for staff training, for reporting requirements to OE)
- has evaluation data ever caused you to make changes in your on-going program? Please describe.

e) capsule summary of evaluation findings

(Collect from program any written information they may have on the results of their program evaluation. Go over this data with the evaluator if it is not understandable or if it needs further summarizing for case study purposes. If they don't have a write-up of their evaluation results, go over the general evaluation findings during the interview which can then be summarized for the case study.)

PART VI: PROGRAM COSTS

a) funding sources and plans for continuation of funding

- how did you (for programs who already have local funding) or how will you (for programs still being supported by OE) go about obtaining financial support for the program?
- do you have any comments related to the difficulty/ease of obtaining funds for your type of program?

b) tuition fees

- do any of your students pay tuition or fees to come to the program? (if no, skip to next question)
- if yes, how much?
- is tuition based on a sliding fee scale according to the ability to pay?

c) budget information

- could we have a copy of your most recent budget?
- have you calculated the per pupil cost of your program? (if yes, ask for it, and ask how it was computed. Also ask if the per pupil data includes a value for in-kind resources.)

PART VII: PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

a) anticipated changes

- do you anticipate making any changes in the program in the near future -- distant future? Please describe.
- how will these changes improve the program? Which aspects of the program will be effected?
- do you have plans for replicating your program or components of it at other sites?
- (if yes) which staff members will be involved in the replication?

PART VIII: NOTABLE FEATURES OF THE PROGRAM

a. description of notable features

- in your opinion, what aspects of your program are most notable, most worthy of study in our case study?
- what aspects of your program have other programs been most interested in learning about?
- which staff, students, parents, community members are involved in these features?

b. process and steps involved

- how were these features developed in the program?
- who were the key persons involved in their development?
- what were some of the obstacles and problems involved in the development of these features?
- what are your future plans regarding these features?

c. replicability of features

- have these features been replicated by other programs to your knowledge? where? how?
- could these features be replicated by other programs? why or why not?
- to what degree are these features dependent on specific kinds of personnel, specific kinds of personnel competencies, the uniqueness of the facilities, other unique program characteristics?
- do these features depend on resources which are not accounted for in the budget? (free space, free consultation services, donated equipment, etc.)
- what about staff -- to what degree do your staff make the uniqueness of your program, such that it couldn't be replicated in another site without your staff?
- what about facilities -- are they so unique that they are difficulte to replicate?

d. staff's recommendations to other programs

- if other programs have replicated or were to replicate these features, what were or would be your recommendations to them regarding startup, operations, staffing, etc.?
- which approaches would you recommend to them?
- what strategies would you sugggest they avoid?
- what would you do differently the second time around re: these features?
- what problems did you encounter which other programs might run into?
- how did you solve or attempt to solve these problems?